CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

April — June 1958

LONDON

S·P·C·K

1958

Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1

Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Professor Leonard Hodgson, D.D.

The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer, Bishop of Exeter.

The Rev. Canon E. S. Abbott, Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.

EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

OLD TESTAMENT PROBLEMS: THE BEGINNING — *Ulrich Simon*

BIBLE AND DOGMA — *J. Burnaby*

THE ATONEMENT AND THE SACRAMENTS — *F. W. Dillistone*

SAINT MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR — *F. P. Harton*

THE PROBLEM OF THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS — *L. W. Barnard*

THE MORAL EMPHASIS IN GORE'S THEOLOGY — *Bishop of Exeter*

LEAVES FROM A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PARSON — *Gordon Huelin*

THE CHURCH AND NUCLEAR WARFARE — *Warren Sandell*

AUXILIARY CLERGY AGAIN — *G. F. S. Gray*

CORRESPONDENCE

REVIEWS

A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.

REVIEWS

DAVID E. ROBERTS (Ed. ROGER HAZELTON): *Existentialism and Religious Belief.* By I. T. Ramsey

WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT: *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process.* By E. O. James

PAUL TILLICH: *Dynamics of Faith.* By C. J. Barker

C. A. CAMPBELL: *On Selfhood and Godhood.* By Geoffrey Allen

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.: *Lamb to the Slaughter.* By Frederick Hood

KARL BARTH: *Church Dogmatics,* Vol. II, Part I. By F. W. Dillistone

DAVID LACK: *Evolutionary Theory and Christian Belief: The Unresolved Conflict.* By A. F. Smethurst

A. J. ARBERRY: *Revelation and Reason in Islam.* By E. F. F. Bishop

LUTHER A. WEIGLE: *Bible Words in Living Language.* By A. D. Power

G. W. H. LAMPE and K. J. WOOLLCOMBE: *Essays on Typology.* By S. H. Hooke

L. H. GROLLENBERG, O.P.: *Atlas of the Bible.* By the Editor

ROGER LLOYD: *The Letters of Luke the Physician.* By Adam Fox

GEORGE S. HENDRY: *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology.* By D. W. Gundry

J. STEVENSON: *A New Eusebius.* By the Editor

MAURICE BEVENOT, S.J. (ed.): *St Cyprian: The Lapsed and the Unity of the Catholic Church.* By H. E. W. Turner

PHILIP CARRINGTON: *The Early Christian Church.* By H. E. W. Turner

J. A. DUKE: *The Columban Church.* By R. E. Turner

PIERS COMPTON: *The Turbulent Priest.* By A. F. Judd

T. F. TORRANCE: *Kingdom and Church: A Study in the Theology of the Reformation.* By Thomas M. Parker

G. H. VALLINS: *The Wesleys and the English Language.* By A. J. Macdonald

ANTHONY TYRRELL HANSON: *The Wrath of the Lamb.* By H. A. Blair

THOMAS VEITCH: *Firmly I Believe;* JIM BISHOP: *The Day Christ Died.* By George Reindorp

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE: *Chichester Cathedral: Its History and Art.* By Colin Dunlop

H. F. MATHEWS: *A Book of Worship for Schools.* By F. A. Poulden

A Directory of the Religious Life. By T. L. Manson

ARTHUR SKEVINGTON WOOD: *Thomas Haweis, 1734-1820.* By Gordon Huelin

BRYAN S. BREED AND OTHERS: *People You Meet;* PATRICK COWLEY: *Receiving the Sunday Gospel;* O. JESSIE LACE: *Why Do We Teach Christianity?* By H. G. G. Herklots

GORDON W. IRESON: *How Shall They Hear?* By George M. Bosworth

C. R. B. SHAPLAND: *Faithful Sayings.* By Clarence May

JAMES BENSON: *Prisoner's Base and Home Again.* By J. W. S. Tomlin

SAMUEL J. WARNER: *The Urge to Mass Destruction.* By Norman Small

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

The Reverend ULRICH SIMON is Lecturer in Hebrew and Old Testament, King's College, London.

The Reverend J. BURNABY is Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.

The Very Reverend F. W. DILLISTONE is Dean of Liverpool.

The Very Reverend F. P. HARTON is Dean of Wells.

The Reverend L. W. BARNARD is Vicar of Shaw, Melksham, Wiltshire.

The BISHOP OF EXETER (The Right Reverend R. C. MORTIMER, D.D.) was formerly Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology at Oxford.

The Reverend GORDON HUELIN, PH.D., is Chaplain of London House and Deputy Minor Canon of St Paul's.

Mr WARREN SANDELL is a former schoolmaster, research student, and civil servant.

The Reverend G. F. S. GRAY is Rector of Fakenham, Norfolk, and was until recently a Fellow of St Augustine's College, Canterbury.

EDITORIAL

BEFORE our next number appears the Lambeth Conference will be in full swing. We venture to offer our own word of most sincere welcome to the Bishops from overseas. In this country we can hardly hope to vie with the lavish hospitality of Minneapolis, but as they go about the country on their "circus" the Bishops will not fail to notice the intense interest aroused by their coming or the cordiality with which their fellowship with us in Christ is recognized. English folk, both in town and country, are in this generation much travelled people. Wherever they go the Bishops, or at least the great majority of them, are certain to find someone who knows the country from which they come and is ready to provide a point of contact.

As for their immediate business, in view of the number of schemes of reunion in the air, the debates are likely to have an even greater importance than ever. It is perhaps in this sphere that the recommendations of Lambeth come nearest to legislation. They are still not that, of course, but the attitude adopted by a conference representing the whole Anglican episcopate towards any communion is bound to form a very strong "persuasive precedent" for the legislative bodies of the Church.

It is in this respect that we are particularly glad to hear of a reduction in the size of the Conference. One sympathizes with those suffragan and assistant bishops who have not received invitations and who will therefore be robbed both of a pleasant outing and of a valued educational experience. This is a loss to the Church as well as to themselves. But the more practical the debates at Lambeth become, the more important is it to recognize the principle "one diocese, one vote". We understand that the desire to get as near as possible to this principle has weighed heavily with the Archbishop of Canterbury in sending out the invitations. There can be little doubt that knowledge of the limitation will strengthen confidence in the Conference throughout the whole Anglican Communion.

It is not often that formal Episcopal Visitations are regarded as much more than a bore, and most contemporary bishops try to avoid them. How exciting and useful they may be was shown in the diocese of Chester when the new diocesan made his first Visitation in May 1957. He had earlier been round the diocese informally and made himself acquainted with his people and their problems. He then issued articles of inquiry. Having digested the replies, he summoned his clergy and churchwardens to convenient centres, and proceeded to give them his charge in seven parts, one at each centre.

That charge has been published by Hodder and Stoughton under the title, *The Churchman's Duty*. It is a model of its kind. It avoids the extremes of international affairs and the parish pump. It deals with the spiritual as well as the material needs of the ordinary churchman. While it applies directly to the diocese of Chester, there is nothing in it that would not be of interest to the Church at large. It is admirably written. The Bishop has inherited from his former master, Cyril Garbett, both a lucidity of statement and a readiness to back up every assertion with statistics, when they may be had, which give his book an air of authority much needed in these disturbed times. Incidentally no one reading the book will have any ground for believing that the Bishop was the aggressor in his famous tiff with the Roman Catholics on the question of the number of Anglican converts to their communion.

The action of the government in refusing to implement the chief recommendation of the Wolfenden Report is difficult to understand. Secular bodies are not normally anxious to make crime synonymous with sin. In this particular instance many religious leaders were loud in asserting that the distinction should be made and observed. Even the most traditionalist of the churches had taken the line of leaving the decision to the individual conscience. If ever a government was given the green light to go ahead with a measure of legal and moral reform it was in this proposal to amend the law in relation to adult male homosexuality.

However the government judged that public opinion is not yet ripe for such a step. The government should know: to estimate the state of public opinion is its *métier*. But if it is correct in its judgement, then something ought to be done at once about educating public opinion. Of the harm done by the present condition of the

law there can be little doubt. Apart from the fact that the notoriety attached to it is beginning to give a false impression about our morals abroad, we have it personally on the statement of a former Lord Chancellor that the amount of blackmail to which it gives rise is really serious. It is indeed possible that the law in this instance actually creates more evil than it is designed to remedy.

In a previous number we undertook to try to fill the gap created by the lamented demise of C.S.S.S., and to publish from time to time articles on the present condition of the various branches of theological study. We are happy to present the first of such articles in the important contribution of Ulrich Simon, which follows, on the contemporary situation of work on the Old Testament.

OLD TESTAMENT PROBLEMS: THE BEGINNING

ULRICH SIMON

THE student of Israel's history faces the problems which belong to the pursuit of all histories: he cannot pinpoint a certain place and a certain time with the simple proposition: "Here begins the history of my chosen subject". He must take into consideration the unrecorded background, however inaccessible; he must look for the ethnic and cultural sources from which the history of the people must have or may have sprung. In the case of Israel this tendency to explore a somewhat dim past is greatly encouraged by the very framework of the Old Testament which constantly reminds us that before Israel came into being in Canaan there had been a very long period of events in widely dispersed regions which were so relevant to the subsequent history that they must be regarded as formative. Hence the historian of Israel is in the extremely uncomfortable position that on the one hand he must deal with a factual situation in Syria and Palestine at about 1000 B.C. and on the other he cannot dismiss but must incorporate several strata of traditions which purport to take him back almost to the beginning of the second millenium B.C.

This problem of the beginning of the Old Testament regains prominence with the appearance of the English translation of Martin Noth's *Geschichte Israels*,[1] which is a major event, if only because no such comprehensive work has appeared since before the last war. Teachers have had to endure a deplorable hiatus for far too long, with the result that the subject has suffered from historical misinformations and distortions whose absurdity must become almost scandalous at a time when illustrated newspapers and popular Bible books highlight the news from Iraq and elsewhere. Now all this is over; neither teacher nor student need to rush to articles in journals to obtain the post-war information, for Noth gives it all in the appropriate places, for this is a *Lehrbuch* in the best sense of the word, factual and scholarly.

As might be expected, Noth's work represents a long tradition of German scholarship and he acknowledges his debt in particular to Albrecht Alt, whose *Kleine Schriften* will not cease to provide a mine of precious data. As regards our problem of the Beginning not only Alt's but also Wellhausen's influence is clearly still at work. One cannot help marvelling even now at the modernity and relevance to contemporary O.T. problems of what Wellhausen wrote in 1883.[2] His method of seeing Israel's history through the institutions of the living cultus, by discerning the nature of the priestly influence and examining the history of the tradition, remains ever active. Indeed one may speak of a history of the Wellhausen tradition.

For Noth, as for his predecessors, the history of Israel cannot begin anywhere except in Israel. He refuses to be enticed by the glamour of the excavations in Mesopotamia, for the history of Israel does not belong to the time of the semi-nomadic migrations as mirrored in the Patriarchal narratives but only to the initial period of the tribal amphictyonies. In Canaan the tribal communities gathered round their cultic centres and gradually became conscious of their supremacy among the settlers in the district; it was their resultant unity which paved the way to nationhood. Noth insists on having the historical *terra firma* under his feet, with its geographical peculiarities of climate and routes. He does not appear troubled by the fact that to begin the history of Israel with the age of the Judges is to run counter to the Biblical tradition in a decisive manner. What, then, is one to make of Abraham from Ur and Haran and of Israel in Egypt?

Unlike some of his contemporaries of the German school, Noth does not dismiss the possible historicity of either the patriarchal or the Exodus tradition. Indeed, as traditions current in the Israel of the settlement (as Noth treats them), they may well preserve echoes of events which had happened. Theories about lunar deities, Canaanitish gods, totemistic folklore are not to be taken seriously. Nevertheless, the chronology of these traditions is quite untrustworthy and the true sequence of events cannot be recovered from the historian's point of view. The evidence in Mesopotamia, which others may be tempted to accept as cogent, throws no light upon the Aramaic movements of the second millenium. Here Noth voices the common complaint of all who would use the common methods of research in this field: in the Old Testament the nature of our

sources is so utterly different from that of Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and other comparative documents. Even later there are no Hebrew royal inscriptions, no archives (except possibly David's) in the proper sense of the word. The ostraca of Samaria and Lachish, the inscription of the Siloam tunnel, etc., yield corroborative evidence, but no more. "What the Assyrian King Sennacherib thought, or wanted others to think, about his invasion of Judah, laying waste cities, and shutting up King Hezekiah 'like a bird in a cage', is known to us from his prism inscription. We have no comparable document from Hezekiah to tell us what he thought about it".[3] This is the trouble all the time. The interpretation of events reaches us only indirectly. If this is true of later history, how much more do we suffer from the lack of direct historical evidence prior to the settlement in Canaan.

One of the most ambiguous pieces of extra-Biblical evidence stems from the similarity of names. There has always been a naïve delight in simple, straightforward identifications. For example, it was once thought (and is now disproved) that Terah was cited in the Ugaritic poems: what could be more attractive than the simple equation with Abraham's Father (Gen. 11. 24)? Noth's caution in his treatment of both names and apparently similar customs is typical and an example to the over-enthusiastic. He has always excelled in the analysis of names and their value for purposes of comparison and always prefers a detailed survey of these "west-Semitic" names to sensational conclusions. He admits that there is analogous material: Ah-ra-am shows affinity with Abram, Ak-bi-Il and (H)akba-ahum to Jacob. Indeed most of the Patriarchal names and those of the sons of Israel occur at Mari in the North as well as in the Egyptian execration texts and at Ugarit. Even so direct conclusions are not permissible. Noth postulates the arrival of non-Accadian peoples in the direction of the Mesopotamian and Syrian districts in the nineteenth-eighteenth centuries to account for the scattered nature of these names which were not of Canaanitish origin; they are seen to be preserved in isolated instances of later Aramaic names, such as Benhadad and Hazael.[4] Hence Mari affinities and Nuzu similarities, which would serve as documentation centuries before the Exodus, must be treated with great care. They merely testify to the general character of the migrations and contacts in the second millenium and not to the Patriarchal movement and way of life in particular. Even the occurrence of "Israel"

on the stele of Merneptah (about 1200 B.C.) is not to be taken as anything approaching proof that the Israel of the Old Testament was then already known in Canaan. Noth certainly provides a wholesome antidote to the fantastic crop of easy and popular identifications.

Noth's scepticism serves as a two-edged sword: it cuts away the results and the very method of historicity-through-identification and thereby deprives us of a beginning of the history of Israel outside the land of Israel. The traditions of the forefathers and of the Exodus are so much adapted to later liturgical and social needs, so full of aetiological and heroizing associations, that they cannot be broken down again into historically trustworthy constituent parts. Significantly Noth does not even attempt a reconstruction of the Exodus in the fashion of H. H. Rowley's *From Joseph to Joshua*, for the "how it must (or may) have happened" cannot be recovered from the O.T. and even less from outside. The oppression in and the liberation from Egypt, the sagas of the Sea, Sinai, Moses the Leader, the wilderness, etc., are themes which have been woven into the tapestry of salvation-history to such an extent that they cannot now be extricated from the whole and evaluated separately and historically. They merely serve to show that a people, or its leading class, looked upon their past in this way. The sequence of the events need not command any objective respect; indeed, the traditions of the Pentateuch bear witness to the great complexity of the literary process which achieved the composition of a so-called narrative. For my part I feel that Noth could have stressed the liturgical character of the Pentateuch even more strongly to make this point.

Strangely enough, however, Noth's presuppositions, though rigid, do not go the whole way towards assessing the Biblical material as spurious. For example, he accepts rather than proves the formation and existence of the twelve-tribe amphictyony and finds sufficient support for this in the claim that the Aramaic development here is not unique but consistent with what happened elsewhere. Yet he fails to show how the whole movement really came into being. He concedes that the ark was a central movable cultic centre (at Shechem-Bethel-Gilgal-Shilo), but we are not told whence it came and why it achieved this fame. Noth acknowledges the importance of the Sinai tradition (Deborah's mention of it cannot but be of the greatest importance), but he does not explain why it attained to and retained such a dynamic place in Israel. Surprisingly he even grants

that Shechem and Jacob had been associated centuries before the tribal possession of the land. If these things are so, then why does he refuse to consider the early traditions of Israel also as the beginnings of the history of Israel? What, in fact, is the difference between history and tradition?

Noth's methods and results are respected even by those who reject them, if only because historical scepticism has a sobering effect upon all. Better still, his work challenges the critics to point towards a better way. In a short work J. Bright protested against Noth's "nihilism" and pleaded for a more balanced approach to the fruits of modern discovery.[5] As a typical spokesman of British and American empirical methods he opposes doctrinaire assumptions. Similarly R. de Vaux comments courteously and yet firmly: "Il nous paraît que cette explication [of Israelite settlements, alleged to have occurred in the ruins of Canaanitish ones] ne rend pas assez justice aux textes et à l'archéologie" and refers to the discoveries at Bethel, Tell Beit-Mirsim, and Tell el Duweir (Lachish).[6]

It is, however, one thing to plead for the inclusion of archaeological data on the one hand, and to agree to a method of how to do it on the other. Ever since the mid-nineteenth century the attraction of exploiting the finds in the Near East has proved irresistible. On the simplest level each piece of evidence gleaned from relevant districts has been set against the assumed corresponding piece in the Biblical record, more often than not in order to "prove" the truth of the Bible. As regards Palestine W. F. Albright has performed yeoman service not only in summarizing the archaeology of that land but also in sketching the history of this archaeology and its quarrels and controversies.[7] Nowadays far greater care is taken in assessing the strata of every dig in order to arrive at a correct chronological estimate, for it is clearly nonsense to misapply, for example, finds of the early Bronze age to events of the Iron age. A steady stream of information reaches the public, particularly in every issue of the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (*BASOR*) and of *Revue Biblique* (*RB*), and this in turn is being incorporated with astonishing success in the numerous new Atlases of the Bible, which by means of pictures and a lucid text make the material available for teachers and students. But precisely owing to this *embarras de richesse* a considerable margin of varying interpretations, and thus of error, remains.

especially when the quest after the Beginning is resumed with the kind of confidence which Noth is seen to eschew.

Strangely enough, it is the interpretation of historical data and not the historical data themselves which cause almost all the trouble. Their evidence occasionally becomes conflicting evidence when they are confronted with the data of the Biblical tradition. This is particularly true of the Biblical Exodus tradition, with which we are here not especially concerned. Yet these events of the latter part of the second millenium B.C. cannot help influencing our approach to the Patriarchal history, inasmuch as the Jacob-Joseph tradition links the latter to the former with embarrassing consistency. If it be admitted that "Hebrew history proper begins with the Exodus"[8] it cannot really be denied that the descent into Egypt is equally historical, even if not all the twelve tribes were originally involved in this movement and even if, as some of the evidence seems to suggest, Joshua came before Moses.[9] During the 430 years in Egypt (Ex. 12. 40-1) there must have been some tribes which did not share the fate of bondage but rather cultivated the tradition of the Fathers in freedom. This seems in fact implied by the tradition of the short period of bondage (Gen. 15. 16, also the LXX of Ex. 12. 40).[10]

The ambiguity of the evidence of the so-called Patriarchal age is well brought out by Albright who freely refers to his own oscillations of judgement.[11] Simple equations (i.e. archaeological evidence = Biblical narrative, irrespective of potential anachronisms[12]) cannot be entertained. On the other hand "eminent names among scholars can be cited for regarding every item of Gen. 11-50 as reflecting late invention, or at least retrojection of events and conditions under the Monarchy into the remote past about which nothing was thought to have been really known to the writers of later days. The archaeological discoveries of the past generation have changed all that".[13] The childhood of Israel—and herein Albright, de Vaux, and Rowley completely agree—can be traced against the Egyptian lacuna of evidence (1750-1580), the fall of Babylon *c.* 1600 and absence of records there until 1400, the Assyrian silence 1780-1450, in short, against the background of anarchy and catastrophic interruptions of history and civilizations. Yet the question persists whether the original migration of Abraham is to be placed before or after 1750 B.C., a date which

roughly suggests the end of the latter part of the Middle Bronze Age.

In one respect the dating of Abraham is beset with greater difficulties than some thirty years ago. De Vaux's judicious words are worth quoting: "Les découvertes des feuilles récentes n'ont apporté aucune confirmation externe de cette première migration".[14] Worse still, the erstwhile inclination to accept Genesis 14 as a reliable jumping-off ground for Abraham is now almost universally abandoned. The account itself, however, is very valuable; indeed the *chanikhim* (trained men, Gen. 14. 14) recall *hnkw* or *ha-naku*, chieftains of the twentieth century. The whole form of its profane record makes it at least probable that Gen. 14 is not a post-exilic invention with an archaic flavour but really a genuine tradition.[15] The only trouble is that it is, as customary, undated and undateable. The former identification Amraphel = Hammurabi has had to be jettisoned, first because the Mari tablets have brought the king's date down to the latter part of the eighteenth century (as against 2100-2000), secondly because the identification of the name is spurious, and lastly, because even if the identification were sound the number of potential Hammurabis would still invalidate the procedure.[16] It may, however, very well be that further finds may at last establish a sound chronological basis for Genesis 14, even if it will always remain something of a problem (*pace* de Vaux) why these "kings" should be found fighting near the Dead Sea.

Three methods may be distinguished by which the extra-Biblical evidence is brought to bear upon the Biblical accounts. First, the data may be listed in a chronological manner. Thus the massive and indispensable book of reference, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament* (ed. J. B. Pritchard, 2nd ed. 1955), presents a selection of the available material both chronologically and regionally under the following headings: 1. Myths, Epics, and Legends; 2. Legal Texts; 3. Historical Texts; 4. Rituals, Incantations, and Descriptions of Festivals; 5. Hymns and Prayers; 6. Didactic and Wisdom Literature; 7. Lamentations; 8. Secular Songs and Poems; 9. Letters; 10. Miscellaneous Texts. It should be noted that no attempt is made here to indicate the nature of the relationship between the texts and the Old Testament.

The second method groups the material geographically and quite simply follows from the start the route of the Patriarchal migrations. This is done in all Bible Atlases: we have a look at Ur[17], the

hypothetical place near the Persian gulf from whence Abram set out; we then travel upstream into the modern oil-producing area and beyond, taking in the finds from Mari and Nuzu to the North; we stop at Haran, the city which flourished in the nineteenth-eighteenth centuries, and make our way into Syria. A special visit is due at Ras Shamra: fortunately the days of sensational Ugaritic discoveries seem to be a matter of the past and instead an astonishingly full and accurate account can be given of a life and culture which declined only after the fifteenth century. The descent into Palestine must include Transjordania and comprehend the evidence which Nelson Glueck collected. He proved that all settled life terminated there *c.* 1850 B.C. The final point of the large sweep from Asia into Africa, i.e. Egypt, will bring into the limelight the whole of the Egyptian history in the second millenium, with special emphasis on the invasion and rule of the Hyksos (1700-1580) as well as on the Tell el Amarna correspondence, with its famous mention of the Habiru.[18]

The third method utilizes the material by harnessing it directly to the chapters of the Bible, the compiler adapting the records to the Biblical tradition, which therefore now governs these records where it used to be governed by them. The very ease of the method should not deceive the reader and obscure the danger through sheer readability. The evidence is gathered from centuries, places, and peoples often far apart from each other and the result may be no less distorted than if and when scholars, say in A.D. 5000, try to reconstruct American history from the dismembered records of European and Asian archives, vaguely dated between A.D. 1600 and 2000.

Abuses, however, do not do away with the proper use: in his *Introduction to Old Testament Times*, 1953, C. H. Gordon employs the last method with validity and shows what can be done with due caution. It is interesting to compare this work of a typical representative of modern research with that of one of the last generation, such as A. Jeremias, whose pan-Babylonian key to the Bible has now been superseded.[19] Both scholars take their readers through the Patriarchal narrative chapter by chapter. In Jeremias's work, lavishly illustrated and altogether not without touches of genius, the sagas of the Patriarchs are set against *mythological* background material; Gordon seeks for and establishes social and political parallels. For example: the Repha'im of Gen. 14. 5 are not

"shades", but real people; the events of Abraham and Eliezer, the birth of Isaac, the divine meal, the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael, the purchase of Machpelah and other negotiations, such as concerning birthrights and blessings and marriage-contracts, the Teraphim which Rachel stole and Laban failed to recover . . . in short the main bulk of the narrative in Genesis 14—33 receives its confirmatory explanations from Mari and Nuzu (Hurrian law and custom), Ugarit and Amarna. Even the Philistines (Gen. 20 and 26) are no anachronism before 1500 B.C., and the mention of YHWH in 24, 31 is genuinely ancient. No doubt the pendulum will once again swing away from this expression of confidence.

There remains in any case one bewildering obscurity. Despite the almost overwhelming nature of the accompanying evidence we face a gaping chronological hole in the very centre of our new historical foundations. Even now the question of the "When?" remains unanswerable. Gordon favours a late date for Jacob (late in the fourteenth century), Rowley puts the Joseph tribes in Israel about 1400; on the other hand de Vaux, supported by Albright, gives a much higher date for Abraham (1850 or a little later), Parrot the eighteenth century, Burrows the nineteenth century. Not too much should be made of these discrepancies of views, serious though they are. They merely serve to stress the obvious point that parallels on sociological and ethnic levels may exist in societies which are in fact divided off by centuries. Thus a conservative tribe of bedouins may even reflect some Patriarchal customs to this very day.

The positive approach to the Patriarchal age has a further and somewhat unexpected consequence. Albright notes how the cosmogonic narratives of Gen. 1—11 act as a support for the route taken through the Balikh valley to Haran and how Gen. 11 in particular reflects the foundation of Babylon by Sargon of Accad.[20] This observation marks the departure from the accepted point of view which excluded Gen. 1—11 as an extra-historical prelude and therefore dismissed the whole block of narrative as irrelevant to the enquiry of the Beginnings. But this attitude is no longer tenable now. First of all, certain episodes like the Flood recall some Mesopotamian memories which are based upon experienced fact, namely floods or a flood during the Sumerian age before Abraham, an interruption of civilization in a certain area. According to Woolley only some higher settlements of the Sumerians in the

lower valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates, such as Ur, survived the disaster. The impression was unforgettable and it became part of the stock mythology of the beginnings.[21]

The foreign myths relevant to the Bible do more than bring into perspective the Biblical narratives, such as that of the Flood. Their point is not so much to be found in evidential identification or in the historical proposition "it happened": rather these myths bring to a head the whole problem of the relationship between Oriental mythology and the Biblical beginnings as contained in Genesis 1—11. The negative evaluation of these so-called mythological strands failed to recognize that they have this in common with all myths: they are *ipso facto* historical documents inasmuch as they were once used in a cultic setting of certain historical communities. The confusion of thought, which speaks of "mere myth", has largely come to an end thanks to the work and triumph of the Myth-Ritual school. No one lacks nowadays the necessary awareness that the myths were the spoken parts of once-living rites and that somehow this must affect our formal estimate of Genesis 1—11 and, therefore, of the Beginnings of the Old Testament.

The impact of modern research must consequently lead to a revision of previously held "assured results" of literary criticism. The Graf-Wellhausen fabric had already been in jeopardy before the full force of form-criticism and the new stress on oral tradition had made themselves felt. The constant sub-division of sources—which in effect ascribes the smallest sections of narrative to different redactors within the source—must in itself defeat the original framework of sources.[22] More devastatingly, however, must be the realization that one of the linchpins of the whole vehicle of literary criticism was always more or less in a faulty position. Even Wellhausen postulated that the Priestly Code (RQ, now generally referred to as P), "the red thread on which the pearls of JE are threaded" (*Proleg.* p. 351), had itself elements of antiquity. But now P can no longer be regarded at all as a late, post-exilic thread, for the Oriental parallels suggest that the P material stems from an age long before the foundation of the Monarchy. Indeed, the very attempt to determine the "earliest source" is seen to be doomed to disappointment and is probably the sort of question that should never be put anyhow. The song of Deborah is certainly old, but it does not mark the beginning of a tradition, and the same can be

said of the collections of small poems, oracles, and the like (Yashar, the Wells, the Wars).

A re-assessment of Genesis 1—11 had long been overdue. It had been obvious for a very long time that the extra-Biblical evidence demanded to be taken seriously, here as everywhere else. It is methodologically indefensible to quote the mythical counterparts of Genesis 1 and to refrain from the implied conclusion that there is a common link which places the origins of Genesis not only earlier than the conventional date, given for P (*c.* 400 B.C.), but that it is very "early" indeed. The P theory proper can only survive if we assume that some "priests" picked up Babylonian mythology during the Exile and then deliberately transformed the hated material, but of this there is absolutely no evidence. On the contrary the presence of so much "primitive" material in P (e.g. man is made in the image (*tzelem*) of God), which always constituted a difficulty, must make us pause; when we add the many items of legislation, religious and secular—if such a division may be made—we can no longer ascribe a late date to P.

The form-critical *Gattungsforschung*, which looks for types rather than sources of literature, owes most of all to Gunkel and Mowinckel and is nowadays thought to be most radically applied by the Uppsala school. It is here that P, though retained as a convenient label, is given its due weight of antiquity, not least because its mythological element, though wholly transmuted, constitutes one of its most important features. But this does not mean that there is a general agreement as to the provenance and the date of the tradition; A. Bentzen, for example, is critical of the "extremism" of Engnell, whose work is unfortunately not yet accessible in English. However, Engnell's "P Tradent" cannot be denied his antiquity, for he has taken up, in typically Oriental fashion, what he has found, and that in quite unaltered form. Even the stylistic formalism, formerly one of the main criteria of "lateness", is not late but a genuine part of the tradition.[23]

The mythical nature of Gen. 1—11 does not invalidate but rather establishes this Prelude of the Old Testament for what it is; the Beginning, intentionally put there by unknown schools of an unknown time.[24] The interest of the P document (if we may still call it by that name) in Beginnings had always been noticed; the reiteration of the *Toledoth* in so many places is too conspicuous to be ignored (Gen. 2. 4; 5; 6. 9; 10; 11. 10; 11. 27, etc.). What is new,

however. is the reassessment of this part of the *Urschrift* as a tradition of the Beginning by which we reach the threshold of history. These lists are meant to lead up to the election of Israel, for the *Toledoth* of Adam, Noah, Abram, Isaac are all stepping stones towards the specific *Heilsgeschichte* which God enacts on earth after Man has been cast out of the divine society. By interpreting history in this way and establishing continuity through salvation-history the Tradent joins the historical facts to the theological presuppositions. But whence came these? They are themselves ascribed to God's revealing power and word in history. The intimacy of this connection makes it impossible now to sever the one from the other, and it is not to be wondered at that those who distrust the soundness of the theological tradition have also little use for Israel's historical tradition, for the "facts" are hardly ever transmitted in an untheological manner, as if YHWH did not exist. We would say that the schools as a whole, and the P Tradent in particular, are "engaged" and therefore committed to a point of view without which they would be unknown to us. Their "facts" would have remained lost in obscurity if they had not been preserved by the divinely guided society.

The traditio-historical approach frees us from pursuing the somewhat empty question of who borrowed from whom. In considering Genesis 1 by itself, for example, no one would venture to stipulate the existence of a direct loan from the *Enuma elish*. The tradition of the beginning of all beginnings, from which all *Toledoth* are known to issue forth, raises practically all questions afresh. If it be ancient—and there can be little doubt of that—was it, in fact, used in a liturgical manner, say at a New Year's Festival? If so, why is there nothing quite like it in the Psalter? Why is the whole account so short, too short, surely, to fill up a lot of liturgical time, even if endlessly repeated? What, one may ask, became of this (oral?) tradition during the Mosaic period? Was it ever heard in the pre-exilic Temple? Lack of evidence compels us to keep a guarded silence, though we may certainly note the affinity of the chapter with Isa. 45 and the whole prophetic preaching of God the Creator and the creation. We may even conjecture that the prophetic schools adapted the ancient myth-ritual to their own use, but again we lack all manner of proof. We cannot even tell when at long last the spoken words became literature with a distinctly theological bias.

Yet this accumulation of negative facts brings out the fusion of many factors which must have contributed to the making of Genesis 1. The antiquity of the account and the continuity of the tradition in Israel's history are part of the ever-changing institutions; however flexible these were at different times they retained the theme of the Beginning as an absolutely necessary point of national and religious reference. In this respect Genesis 1 illustrates magnificently the nature of salvation-history, for here a living people recite, in a given political, liturgical situation, the things pertaining to the beginning, of which they were not eye-witnesses at all. Thus sacred history (of God's acts) is made public and intoned in secular history, adapted for peculiar usage, and ultimately handed on in written form.[25]

Genesis 1—11, taken as a whole, testifies to the Biblical redactors' awareness of the problem: there is the Beginning beyond history, outside the world, and there are the beginnings of tribes and peoples, pre-historical and historical civilizations. The former leads up to the latter, almost as if to prepare us for the inevitable tension between the eternal and the temporal. The Beginning of Genesis 1 is different in kind from all other beginnings. Whereas Genesis 6 still recalls the ancient myth of the fighting God and of the marrying sons of Elohim and their ill-fated progeny, God in Genesis 1 speaks of his own unique "Let there be" in creation. In this revelatory Prelude we part company with all other *Toledoth* and their generations and successors. Here we stand at "the Beginning" (*Bereshith*) and not at one point of successive makings and begettings and returns to what had been. Here the Bible interprets itself and promises the key to the problem; where and when is the head of things?

Some of the ancient commentators seem to have anticipated what has become so signally the problem of twentieth century Biblical exegesis. How, they also ask, are we to think of this Beginning? After all, the ordinary Jewish, and later the ordinary Christian, layman would expect to hear something intelligible in terms of his own society. In this respect the Midrashim deserve re-examination because they reflect the simplicity of the Palestinian Targumim.[26] By way of contrast we turn to Philo who has bequeathed to posterity a tradition of exegesis which fully acknowledges the gulf between the historical and the super-historical. For Philo Genesis 1 is neither myth nor a complex literary contrivance

but the account of the Beginning, not of time, but before time, inasmuch as the temporal world still had to come into being (*Op. Mund.* 26). If this were not so then, as Rashi (1040-1105) observed (again on Gen. 1, 1) the Bible might begin with Exod. 12. 2, i.e. with historical institutions; but for Israel's sake, to show his cosmic sovereignty and universality, God gave the proof against all enemies when it is written *Bereshith* and not *Berishonah*, i.e. not in the Beginning, but "in the beginning of the creation of Heaven and earth, when the earth was without form and confused mass . . . God said: . . .". In this remarkable way Rashi unites the metaphysical and the historical strands of the tradition and finds his authority in the text and its peculiar idiom.[27]

The present survey has shown that different methods must lead to different results. The Old Testament is no exception to this rule. But the best of Jewish and Christian exegetes have also shown, and modern scholarship may suggest that they were right, that it is a mistake to pursue one course only, to rely on one method exclusively, in order to obtain tidy results. In the question of the Beginning, for example, one may be predisposed to dogmatize: the Old Testament begins with Israel in Israel, or with the source J, or with the person of Moses, or with the earliest myth, common to all nations, or with the work of the prophetic compilers or the theological achievement of the priests. All these views are right in their own way and wrong in their isolation. The secular-historical method, as well as literary source-criticism and form-criticism, the comparative method, the theological evaluation, are all perfectly valid in their own field, but the richness of the Old Testament cannot be comprehended by any one method, however valid: the origin of words within the general Oriental pattern and their constant transmission and change by prophetic-priestly schools or by inspired individuals, who are eye-witnesses of certain events, the slow growth of "literature" *per se*, are all together causes instrumental in the making of Holy Scripture. The early chapters in Genesis urge afresh in the light of modern knowledge that the complexity of this composition be taken seriously. If some exegetes venture to see in this almost impenetrable complexity the essential vesture of the self-revealing Word of God, the revelatory mystery of the self-unfolding Creator, they stand at least within the best tradition. We have perhaps an even greater incentive than our forefathers to move on several levels at once, sensitive to the literary

genius, *au fait* with cultic forms, open to comparative data, anxious to establish historical links wherever possible with meticulous objectivity, aware of the theological problems, and even unashamed of the mystical tradition[28] and its modern equivalent, and always checking the relevance of the material against the critique of human experience. Thus the Old Testament presents the scholar and preacher of the present day not only with an exciting task but also with a deliberate methodology which the material demands.

1 Martin Noth, *The History of Israel*, A. and C. Black, 1958, 42s.

2 *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels.* The narrative of the Hexateuch, though W. acknowledges its ancient strands, is only brought into view after the discussion of the cultic setting and the history of the tradition.

3 Cf. M. Burrows on Israel in *The Idea of History in the Ancient East*, ed. R. C. Dentan, 1955, pp. 101 f.

4 Cf. esp. M. Noth, "Mari und Israel" (*Geschichte und Altes Testament, Albrecht Alt zum 70. Geburtstag*, 1953, pp. 127-52).

5 J. Bright, *Early Israel in Recent History Writing*, 1956. The author shows from American history how history and tradition coinhere even in the formative period immediately after the event.

6 From a review in *RB* 53/1946, p. 475.

7 Easily accessible in *The Archaeology of Palestine*, 1949, esp. ch. II.

8 C. R. North, *The Old Testament Interpretation of History*, 1946, p. 2.

9 This *locus classicus* of a decisive discrepancy between Biblical and non-Biblical evidence remains and is chiefly due to the complexity of several strands of narrative and unrelated items of Egyptian history. Cf. esp. H. H. Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua*, 1950, pp. 141 ff., for a survey of views favouring and opposing this radical reconstruction.

10 Thus this typical and caustic criticism loses its point: "It is absurd to assume that tradition has preserved an accurate and minute account of the trivial family events in the lives of the patriarchs, the places where they happened. . . .", A. Lods, *Israel*, E.T. 1932, p. 158. Aetiological retrojection is not the only valid coin. Continuity of tradition is at least as powerful and accurate.

11 Cf. *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, 1951, pp. 6 ff.

12 An interesting and typical subject is the domesticated camel in Gen. 24; de Vaux and Gordon, however, deny the anachronism. Cf. C. H. Gordon, *Introduction to Old Testament Times*, 1953, pp. 108 f., with ref. to Iraq 6, 1939, Pl. II, 9.

13 W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period*, 1952, p. 3.

14 *RB*, 55/1948, p. 322.

15 Ibid., pp. 326 ff.

16 Cf. H. H. Rowley, "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age", in *The Servant of the Lord*, 1952, pp. 283 f.

17 Cf. P. Dhorme, *RB* 35/1926, p. 75: "C'est avec la dynastie d'Ur que nous pénétrons vraiment sur le sol de l'histoire". The old problem of Ur of the Chaldees (Gen. 11. 28; 15. 7) remains, however, unsolved. Sir Leonard Woolley's *City of Abraham* must leave a margin of doubt, if only because of the strange omission of "Ur" in the LXX. Albright first followed the lead of the LXX in the 1946 edition of *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (p. 179) and subsequently preferred the MT (cf. n.1, *The Biblical Period*) and the 2nd edtn. of *From the Stone Age* . . . G. E. Wright, on the contrary, accepts Haran and not Ur (*Biblical Archaeology*, 1957, p. 4). The popular theory that Abraham left Ur because of the change of the dynasty and a switch from Moon (Sin) worship to Sun worship is now no longer seriously entertained by many.

18 This is primarily a problem of equations: *Habiru* (SA-Gaz), *Apiru-Apiriu-'pr* etc. seem to belong to one linguistic family to which *'eber* (Gen. 10. 21, 25) also may belong. But these Hebrews were really different people in different places at different times. De Vaux distinguishes between (1) prisoners to be ransomed (Asia Minor); (2) mercenaries (Babylon); (3) enemy bands (Mari); (4) foreign workers (Nuzu); (5) turbulent bands (Amarna); (6) mercenaries (Hittite); (7) people of the steppe (Ugarit); (8) prisoners of war (Egypt). Moreover, as de Vaux observes, Abraham does not fit into any of these classes, for he is not a warrior and does not represent a violent tribe (cf. *RB*, 55/1948, pp. 340 ff.). There also remains to be taken into consideration the strong Biblical tradition of the Aramaic connection (Gen. 22. 21; Deut. 26. 5; Hos. 12. 12) as well as the Hittite (?)—Amorite slur in Ezek. 16. 3.

19 A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, 1930, which is much to be preferred to the older edition from which the E.T., 1911, is derived.

20 Cf. Albright, *The Biblical Period*, 1952, pp. 3 ff.

21 This is still true even if we conclude with A. Parrot, *The Flood and Noah's Ark*, 1955, that Woolley's identification of the Flood Stratum at Ur is neither correct nor relevant.

22 This was already foreshadowed in a remarkable way by Cheyne, well over fifty years ago, when he wrote an additional note on the Hexateuch: "A purely literary criticism has had its day . . . we are catching a glimpse of the new methods . . ." (*E.B.*, II, p. 2057). Yet source-criticism has proved tenacious in its hold on O.T. scholarship. Cf. for example R. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1949; C. A. Simpson, *The early Traditions of Israel*, 1948; O. Eissfeldt, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, which is about to be published in an English translation.

23 Cf. A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, Part II (1949), esp. p. 20. Bentzen believes, however, in some stratification in Gen. 1–3 (pp. 60 ff.). On the inter-Scandinavian struggle cf. Pt. I (1948), pp. 103 ff. See also C. R. North's article "Pentateuchal Criticism" in *Old Testament and Modern Study*, pp. 48-83, which reflects the general state of uncertainty and fluidity in the whole field (slightly obscured by the final tentative diagram!).

24 S. H. Hooke works on this assumption with great success. Cf. *In the Beginning*, 1947, which ranks as vol. VI in the Clarendon Bible and yet obviously must now come before the original vol. I—a sign of the times!

25 Hence the inevitable emergence of a part-secular, part-sacred history, which creates difficulties of its own. For an interesting but mistaken protest cf. R. Pfeiffer, *J.B.L.* 70/1951, pp. 1 ff. Aiming especially at Albright and Burrows he pleads for either secular (mostly J) or sacred (P) elements, and not a conflation of both ("by *suppressio veri* and *assertio falsi*"). But is not Genesis 1–11 just precisely that kind of synthesis?

26 In the first place the Midr. R. (ignoring here the confusion of the text) supports the Mishnaic and Talmudic warnings against speculating on "what was before and what is to be after the Creation" (cf. Chag. 11 ff.)—"The intention to create Israel preceded everything else"; "the world was made for the Torah". The Torah (=wisdom) was consulted by God. Torah and Throne were created, the Patriarchs, Israel, Temple, the Name of the Messiah, were contemplated before all by God. The initial Beth stands against further enquiry (above and below, before and behind), as well as for the two worlds and the Blessings of creation. The historical, scientific, and reflective levels of exegesis yield here entirely to "the theological needs of the times", i.e. the rehabilitation of Judaism.

27 Similarly in the Christian tradition of exegesis much is made of and said of the peculiar *Bereshith* of Gen. 1. 1. Cf. A. Levene, *The early Syrian Fathers* on Genesis, 1951, esp. p. 71. The pre-existence implied by *Bereshith* "excludes any previous existence of space, time, duration, or any kind of physical quality whatever, or material extension, except God who ordered these things". A further complication and enrichment came in through the prolegomenon of John 1. 1 where the identity of the expression is to be noted though not to be confused. Cf. Origen, De Princ. II. 9. 1; III. 6. 8 for understanding the ambiguity of Gen. 1. 1 aright, namely the Beginning in the absolute sense; St Augustine, *Conf.* XI, 3 ff. (esp. ch. 8 for the "immutable Beginning"); *De Gen. ad litt.* passim, *De Civ. Dei* XI, 4-6; XII. But as against this tradition cf. the discussion of the problem in Ryle, *The Book of Genesis*, 1914, pp. 2 f.

28 For the variety of interpretations on, for example, "Noah Drunk", cf. Helen Gardner, *The Limits of Literary Criticism*, 1956.

BIBLE AND DOGMA

J. BURNABY

[*The following was delivered as a lecture at King's College, London, at the invitation of Professor D. E. Nineham, who asked for an "exposition of the process by which Christian doctrine is formulated on the basis of the Biblical revelation".*]

THE question we are to consider is this: What is the nature of the connection between the canonical Scriptures and the dogmas of the Christian Church, the statements in which the essential elements of our faith are formulated? In what sense do we or can we claim that Christian doctrine as we may present it to-day is derived from Scripture or founded upon it, and by what method is the derivation or foundation established?

We may conveniently begin by reminding ourselves of the terms in which this question was answered by the English Reformers in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, "agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces and the whole Clergy, in the Convocation holden at London in the year 1562 for the avoiding of diversities of opinions and for the establishing of consent touching true religion."

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation" (Art. VI.)

"The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." (Art. VIII.)

"The Church, as it ought not to decree anything against Holy Writ, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation." (Art. XX.)

What the framers of the Articles call beliefs "necessary to salvation" are those which I have rather more cautiously described

as "essential elements" of the Christian faith. The purpose of the Reformers was to release these essential doctrines from the accretions or perversions in which the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages was thought to have involved them; and for this purpose all that was needed to be asked was whether a doctrine was contained in Scripture or could be proved thereby. They would doubtless have been prepared to indicate those "certain warrants" of Holy Scripture which "proved" the statements of the Athanasian Creed: e.g. those which assert that Christ is one, "not by confusion of substance but by unity of person"; or that in the Trinity "none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal"— and so to justify the Creed's further statement: "He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity." But it was by no means so easy for the Reformers to give plausibility to their view of the relation of doctrine to Scripture as it was for their Catholic opponents to maintain their own. Both sides took for granted the finality of the Christian revelation: Catholic no more than Protestant would allow that anything has been or could be added to that revelation since the death of the last Apostle. But it was and remains Roman doctrine, not only that unwritten tradition received by the Church from the Apostles is a source of Christian dogma equally valid with the letter of Scripture, but that the Church has been empowered by the Holy Spirit to clarify what was obscure and draw out what was implicit in Scripture itself. And a doctrine which cannot be found in Scripture, and may be difficult to prove by any "certain warrants" of Scripture, can much more easily be defended as making clear or explicit what was in Scripture contained only obscurely or by implication.

In the controversies of the sixteenth century, however, there were other presuppositions, with regard both to the inspiration of Scripture and to the nature of the revelation contained in it, which were common to both sides. It was not doubted either that the revelation of God had been given in the form of statements having absolute truth, or that the Scripture in which this revelation is conveyed was exempt from error in every particular. It followed, first, that the truth of a doctrine expressly stated in Scripture is thereby guaranteed; and second, that doctrines not expressly stated in Scripture may be "proved", if they are deducible from Scriptural texts used as premises. It must also follow, that if any two state-

ments in Scripture appear to conflict with one another, it must be possible to show that the conflict is only apparent; for the truth of both is equally guaranteed by that inspiration.

These are consequences of the particular beliefs about the inspiration of Scripture and the method of revelation which were held in the sixteenth century. In our own time different views on both these subjects have become fairly common ground among Christian theologians. It is now widely held that the revelation of which Scripture is the record is not to be identified with a number of statements about God—though it may and indeed must lead those who accept it to make such statements. The Scriptural revelation is the act of God making himself known to men as Person to persons—as Creator, Lord, and Father to creatures, servants, and children—and by the same act reconciling the world to himself. God has come in Jesus Christ to meet men; and the New Testament is the witness of men who have encountered Christ and have found in that encounter the knowledge of God. That which they have seen and heard they declare unto us also, that we also may have fellowship with them; and their fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. The personal knowledge on which such fellowship is grounded cannot be conveyed in statements any more than I can make you know my friend by telling you about him. The purpose of the statements made by those who have seen and heard is to enable those who have not to receive the same revelation and enter into the same fellowship; but the statements themselves are not and cannot be the revelation. And this is borne out by the unmistakeable fact that the writers of the New Testament (like those of the Old) have different ways of expressing their witness to the revelation. St Paul, St John, and the *auctor ad Hebraeos* are speaking about the same thing: but they speak differently, and the differences are not to be eliminated or reduced. Their inspiration has not flattened out their individualities or their idiosyncrasies; it is to be discerned, not in identity or even in consistency of verbal statement, but in the response which they have been enabled to make to the Word of God in Christ, and in the power given them to communicate that Word to others.

Accordingly, the student of the New Testament will not approach his inquiry from the viewpoint of what he has learnt to regard as orthodox Christian doctrine. He will not be searching the literature of the primitive Church for pieces which can be assembled so as to

compose a doctrinal system as nearly as possible identifiable with the later orthodoxy. Instead of this, he will allow each New Testament writing to speak for itself: he will assume neither that all the writers must agree with one another, nor that the same writer must always be consistent with himself; he will take seriously St Paul's claim to have become all things to all men, and its natural implication of readiness to adapt forms of statement to the situation of the persons addressed; and he will thus be prepared to find that the New Testament contains not one uniform theology but a variety of theological types.

We are accustomed to read the sermons in the early chapters of Acts as preserving for us the general tenor of the Gospel as the Apostles first presented it to their own countrymen. That Jesus, whom God had raised from the dead, was the expected Messiah, the pre-destined instrument of salvation, that in his coming God had visited and redeemed his people as he had promised to their forefathers, that forgiveness of sins and the power of the Holy Spirit were available to all who would through the baptism of repentance take Jesus for their Lord, and wait in confidence for the final manifestation of God's Kingdom on earth—this was the substance of the *kerygma*, the proclamation of the good news of Christ; and to accept it was to have place in the true Israel, to inherit the sure promises of God.

Obviously, a mission preaching in such terms would be intelligible only to Jews or to those who had become more or less familiar with the Jewish religion—the "God-fearing" fringe of the Synagogue in the Roman Empire. Acts makes it clear that in fact the Christian mission began everywhere in the synagogue; and most of the infant churches must have looked more like nonconforming offshoots of the local synagogue than anything else. Acts offers us only a single specimen of a missionary address to an exclusively heathen audience; but it is not likely that St Paul's unsuccessful experiment at Athens represents a typical method of approach where no Jewish background could be assumed. We know very little of how the Gospel might be preached when the missionaries "turned to the Gentiles": in all probability the local church continued to grow generally by poaching on the synagogue—to the very understandable indignation of the latter. But whether the convert was well or ill informed on the faith of Judaism, and whatever it may have been in the Christian preaching that carried conviction

to his mind, when once he had accepted the Gospel and entered into the fellowship of the Christian community, the *Ecclesia* of the Messiah, he would go on to receive in that fellowship what Acts calls the doctrine of the Apostles, the *didache*, the teaching which is exemplified for us in the New Testament Epistles and the tradition preserved for us in the Gospels of all that Jesus himself began to do and to *teach*.

The last verses of St Matthew's Gospel record the risen Christ's charge to his Apostles to go and make disciples of all nations, *teaching* them to observe all things that he had commanded them; and there is no reason to doubt that this fairly represents what the Apostles did in fact teach their first converts, and that it was in this way that the memory of Christ's own teaching was preserved. It is probable also that from the first the Scriptures were constantly searched for confirmation of the claim made in the *kerygma* that Jesus was indeed the Christ foretold in them. In particular, the story of the Passion was so told as to show that even in the rejection of Christ by his own people the Scriptures had been fulfilled.

So far, there would be nothing to give rise to serious divergences. Teachers were a gift of God to the Church, no less than Apostles and Prophets (1 Cor. 12. 28). But the teaching itself, at least as soon as it came to be given in a number of more or less isolated groups of converts, would vary both in form and content with the varying personalities and experiences of the individual teachers. No doubt, it was variation of this kind that gave rise to the so-called "parties" in the Corinthian Church which St Paul deplores: "I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas". Even in the case of the Synoptic Gospels, we have to come to appreciate the different lights in which a common tradition of the Church appears as presented by a number of different compilers. St Paul himself can speak of a *typos didachés*, a pattern of teaching to which the Christians of Rome have been "delivered"—entrusted as to a guardian; yet the pattern of his own teaching in Romans and Galatians is not the same as in 2 Corinthians or in Colossians/Ephesians.

But the individuality of the teacher is not the only or the most important source of variety in the teaching. It was not long, as we know, before questions of truth and error arose. The first and most momentous controversy bore upon the terms of admission to the Church for Gentile converts; and it was out of this controversy that the characteristically Pauline doctrines of grace, faith, and justifi-

cation, set forth in Galatians and Romans, emerged. And as soon as churches had been established in centres of Hellenistic culture such as Corinth we find St Paul involved in fresh controversies, compelling him to defend the Gospel he had preached by further elaborations of his own understanding of it, ending in the "high Christology" of the Epistle to the Colossians. In the Johannine writings, the effect of polemical impulse upon theological development, though not always so apparent on the surface, is not less determinative. "John" is confronting danger to the faith on two sides: it has to be defended and asserted both against dissipation into the false spiritualism of Greek religious thought, and against imprisonment in an unspiritual Jewish eschatology. And these needs evoke the characteristically Johannine doctrines of the Word made flesh and of the present possession of eternal life.

If this is anything like a true account of what we find in the New Testament, if we cannot speak of any one homogeneous theological pattern to which all its writers conform, it becomes all the more difficult to avoid the question, How did that pattern which we call orthodoxy come to shape itself during the four centuries that followed?

So far, we have not distinguished "doctrine" from "dogma"; and we are accustomed to-day to speak of Christian doctrine as though it meant the body or sum of accepted dogmas of the faith. But it would clearly be inappropriate to use the word "dogma" of the *didaché*, the teaching or instruction in the faith which in the New Testament, as we have seen, is to be distinguished from the *kerygma*, the central message of the Gospel as delivered by its missionaries. "Doctrine", in general, is the form which Christian teaching assumes in the hands of an individual teacher or group of teachers. A particular doctrine will be the expression given in such a context to a particular element of the faith which is the subject of instruction—whether it be the person of Christ, the significance of his death, the nature of the Church, or the principles of Christian life and conduct. Dogma, in the strict sense of the word, is a decision taken by competent authority in order to settle a dispute about doctrine; and in this sense, perhaps the only dogma contained in the New Testament is the decision by the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem (in Acts 15) that circumcision should not be enforced upon Gentile converts—which was what certain men who had come down from Judaea, had *taught* the brethren at Antioch.

The great age of dogma is of course the century and a half which followed the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the Empire, when diversity of teaching was regarded as damaging to the effectiveness of that religion as a bond of unity in the State. Dogmatic orthodoxy became the postulate of an established Church.

But the foundations of dogma were being laid in the development of doctrine which is traceable from the beginning.

In the second century, the defenders of Catholic Christianity against the menace of Gnosticism were accustomed to appeal to a *Regula Fidei*, a Rule of Faith, by which the identity and continuity of Christian teaching was ensured. This Rule, as it is quoted e.g. by Irenaeus and Tertullian, shows no verbal fixity; but it runs closely parallel to the baptismal confession of faith, which was already becoming stereotyped in the form of what we know as the Old Roman Creed—of which our Apostles' Creed is the direct descendant. There is sufficient evidence from the second century that the candidate for baptism was required to affirm his adherence to the faith, by answering *Credo*, "I believe", to a series of questions corresponding to the three sections of the *Regula*. The structure of the confessions is naturally framed upon the formula of baptism in the Three-fold Name, which is at least as old as St Matthew's Gospel; and its content is entirely Biblical. The New Testament seems to reflect a period when baptism had no preliminary conditions beyond acceptance of the invitation extended in the *kerygma*. Only the Western text of Acts 8. 37, in the account of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch, shows the beginnings of a formal baptismal confession: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." On the other hand, the New Testament preserves certain formulae of Christian confession, of which the most concise is the "Jesus is Lord" of Romans 10. 9 and 1 Corinthians 12. 3. For the Jewish convert, acceptance of the Gospel would imply acceptance of the claim that Jesus (in the words of Romans 1. 4) has been "designated Son of God with power in the Holy Spirit by the resurrection from the dead". For the Gentile, the confession that Jesus is Lord would need to be set upon its Jewish background of faith in the One Creator and the working of his Spirit in man. No doubt, in such confessions, dogma is already present in a rudimentary form; and the process of expansion into the *Regula Fidei* would be natural enough. But what

we have to observe is that the second century *Regula*, and even the later Apostles' Creed, exhibits so much *less* development in doctrine than is to be found within the New Testament itself. The Christology of the Apostles' Creed is limited to the titles Son of God and Lord, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection and Ascension, and the future coming as Judge; and *all* this (except the Virgin Birth) is present in the sermons of Peter in Acts 2 and 10.

As a summary of Christian doctrine, the *Regula*, even in comparison with the primitive *kerygma*, has an extremely jejune appearance. But of course doctrine, teaching, is just what it is not. In the second century as in the first, teaching, instruction in the faith, is something that follows upon conversion—with the difference that whereas in the beginning it was given to persons already admitted by baptism to full membership of the Christian community, it later takes on the character of a preparation for baptism. We know very little of the early history of the catechumenate; but we can safely assume that when the baptismal ceremony has come to include a questioning of the candidate in terms of the *Regula Fidei*, the candidate will not have been expected to reply to such questioning without *some* previous instruction in the meaning and implications of the profession he was to make. As to the nature of this instruction we have no clear evidence till much later: the earliest surviving examples of Catechetical Lectures are those given by Cyril of Jerusalem in the middle of the fourth century, which (in Dr Telfer's judgement) bring to us in spite of their date the "voice of the ante-Nicene Church". By that time, the general pattern of preparation for baptism has become well established—a course of instruction during Lent, leading up to the *Traditio Symboli*, the "delivery" by bishop to catechumens of the Creed which they are to profess. The instruction itself was the bishop's responsibility, and we can estimate the freedom with which it was exercised by comparing, e.g., the *Catecheses* of Cyril with the *De Fide et Symbolo* of Augustine a generation later. There must have been wide variations in the doctrinal "type" affected by bishops in different churches.

But it is not here that we shall find the source of dogmatic development; though the *Catechesis* is likely to show the effects of such developments as have occurred. The formulation of Catholic doctrine which went on from the second century to the fifth was a process evoked by two needs: first, the need to defend Christianity

against hostile misrepresentation and commend it to the more thoughtful elements of pagan society; and second, the need to maintain the distinctive character of the faith against the disintegrating effects of divergent teaching within the Church. We can compare, in the New Testament, the needs which exercise the writers of Acts on the one hand, and of the Pastoral Epistles on the other. In the second century, the *Logos*-doctrine of the Apologists represents the Church's endeavour to conciliate and attract the educated heathen: the polemic against Gnostic dualism represents the Church's refusal to tear up its own roots in Hebrew religion.

In the third century, we find in the school of Alexandria a modification both of the positive and of the negative reaction of Christian teaching to Greek thought: the *Logos*-doctrine becomes more Christian, and Christianity less anti-Gnostic. And nearly all the great doctrinal controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries issue from the intellectual legacy of the great Alexandrians. In this legacy the most dangerous element was the system of Biblical exegesis with which Origen had buttressed his vast and precarious structure of Christian-Gnostic philosophy and Christian-Gnostic spirituality. It is often said that Alexandrian allegorism saved the Old Testament for the Christian Church; but the price was high, for it came perilously near to treating the New Testament, and especially the Gospels, in a fashion that must have cut Christianity loose from its moorings in history. It proved the doctrines it upheld by "certain warrants" of Holy Scripture only by dint of imposing on the proof-texts the meaning required in order that they might warrant the doctrine.

Unfortunately, the method of reading into Holy Scripture whatever one wishes to be able to read out of it did not come to an end with the disuse of allegorism; and it still presents a temptation to the dogmatist which is not easily resistible. There is only one way of receiving from Scripture the truth which it has been given to convey, and that is to let the texts speak to us in their own language—learning all we can about that language from those best qualified to instruct us; for we must train our ear so that it may hear what the Spirit said unto the churches of the first century. The reverence with which we should approach the New Testament is the scientist's reverence for the facts which he seeks to understand. Its authority for us is the authority of fact, and the fact is simply that when Christ came this was how men were led (as we

believe, *non sine Deo*) to speak of what his coming meant to them. What gives to the writings of the New Testament their *unique* authority, an authority by which all later doctrine must consent to be controlled, is their character as the original documents of a religion that claims to rest upon historical events. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me", said Christ. We have to accept a situation in which none of us can come to Christ but by the witness of his Apostles; and our nearest echo of that witness is in the New Testament.

It might of course be maintained that it should be the work of Christian teachers in every generation, first, to understand the Scriptures, to distinguish what gives unity to the message of the Bible from what is peculiar to this or that writer, what is central from what is peripheral, what is essential from what is accidental; and then, on the basis of such understanding, to develop a doctrine of the act of God in Christ which will be intelligible, or at least not meaningless, to the contemporary mind. But as we know, this is not what has happened. Suppose we take the *Regula Fidei* of the second century, or the Apostles' Creed, as giving us the essential structure of Christian belief. Then we must recognize that the Church has not been content with it. The Church, in certain critical situations of its history, superimposed upon that Rule or Creed statements about matters quite beyond human ascertainment or comprehension: not only about the way in which it has pleased God to become man, but about the eternal being of God himself. And the Church did so, because such statements seemed *at the time* to be necessary in order to maintain the unity and fidelity of Christian teaching. The bishops who took part in the decisions of the first four Ecumenical Councils were not consciously legislating for the Church of a thousand, two thousand, or twenty thousand years later in time than their own: they were thinking of the Church for which they were responsible, of the faith and salvation of their own flocks. But their decisions have in fact become dogmas of the Christian religion, with an authority to all appearances as permanent and inescapable as that of the New Testament itself. We can imagine that Christian *teaching* might use different language about God from that in which the Fathers framed the dogma of the Trinity; but we cannot imagine that any teaching which did not *mean* that God has truly revealed himself as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost could ever win recognition as Christian.

Let us then take this as an essential Christian belief, and try to see how it can be said to belong to the faith of the New Testament. We may fairly claim that the confession "Jesus is Lord" is central to that faith, common to every *Typos didachés*, every variety of doctrine that is to be found in Epistle, Gospel, or Apocalypse. Nor can it be disputed that every writer of the New Testament believes himself to speak from within the faith of the Old, to be an Israelite indeed. For the Greek-speaking Jew, *Kyrios*, Lord, was the holy Name of God: his daily profession of faith was, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is *one Lord*". Evidently, *Kyrios Iesous* did not and could not mean for the Christian convert a sheer identification of Jesus with Jehovah; but neither did it or could it mean the ascription to Jesus of a Lordship independent or secondary. What it did mean was that the man whom Pilate had crucified and whom God had raised from the dead was the object of *worship*, of a religious devotion not different in kind from the reverence and trust rendered by a devout Israelite to the God of his fathers. The astonishing thing is that no New Testament writer appears to feel that his devotion to Christ involves any disloyalty to the one God, any setting up of Lord against Lord: there is no hint of competition or rivalry between the Lord Jesus and the Lord Jehovah. The Lord God is still *one* Lord. Jesus is not Jehovah, but the Lordship ascribed to him is none other than the unique Lordship of the God of Israel. In Jesus the one God is revealing himself as Lord and Saviour: Jesus bears the authority of God.

What has made it possible for this revelation to be received, this authority acknowledged? St Paul's answer, and it is an answer which has nothing in it peculiarly Pauline, is that no man can say "Jesus is Lord", but by the Holy Spirit. In the Old Testament, the Spirit is the power of Jehovah present and working in chosen men. The Spirit is not something different from God, but it is God manifesting himself in a special way—the way of indwelling, or (as we call it) immanence. In the New Testament, the Spirit is this same immanent power of God, present in Jesus the Messiah and imparted by him to his people to possess and unite them with himself. The difference from the Old Testament is simply that now the indwelling power of God is inseparable from the confession of Christ: the Spirit is not the same as the risen and exalted Jesus, but his presence in the whole body of believers replaces the outward presence of Jesus, and supplies all the guidance and strength which

outward presence could give. In fact, the belief that what enables us to confess Christ and to follow him in all godliness of living is nothing less than the real presence of God within us—this belief makes the Christian doctrine of Grace inseparable from the doctrine of the Godhead of the Holy Spirit. Christian life is wholly dependent upon the power of the Spirit, because the Spirit is bearer of the Lordship of Jesus, which is the one Lordship of God.

"So the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord; and yet there are not three Lords but one Lord". In that phrase of the *Quicunque vult*, at least, there is nothing but what can claim "certain warrant" in Holy Scripture. But it falls short of the doctrine of Three Persons in One Substance, distinguished as Persons by their distinct relations to one another. That doctrine, with its technical terms, emerged from the rejection of rival forms of teaching which were professedly designed to maintain the Biblical faith in the unity of God. On one side was the Sabellian theory of a Trinity which was not eternal but temporal—no more than the manifestation of the one God through the historic "economy" or dispensation, under the successive forms and by the successive actions of Christ and the Spirit. This was a theory which removed all offence to rational comprehension. But it ran contrary to the fundamental Christian understanding of man's reconciliation to God in Christ. That reconciliation is a reality, not because God has shown us, in Christ's human life of obedient sonship, the pattern of how we are to live as children of the Father in heaven, but because the possibility for us of becoming our Father's sons is given to us by union with Christ; and union with Christ is union with one whose sonship to God is no transient human relationship but an eternal fact of the divine nature. Opposed to Sabellianism was the Arian theory in its various forms, more acceptable to the imperfectly Christianized mind of the Greek because it frankly presented divinity as a matter of degree. Absolute, supreme Godhead belongs only to the changeless, eternal being of the Father: Son and Spirit are subordinate and minor deities, brought into existence to serve the Father's purpose in creation and redemption. In effect, the Arians were abandoning the Biblical monotheism which they professed to defend; for the worship which they allowed to Christ was idolatry if Christ was less than very God. But they were abandoning at the same time (as Athanasius so clearly saw) the Biblical faith that salvation belongeth unto God. If to be saved is

to have eternal life, that is a gift that cannot come to us from one who does not himself possess the eternal life he is to impart.

It was thus a true appreciation of the faith of the New Testament that led the Church to reject both Sabellian and Arian interpretations, however faulty the exegesis of texts by which the rejection was supported. The final decision upon the doctrinal dispute—the dogma of the Trinity—was virtually contained in the application of the single non-Biblical word *Homo-ousios*, "of one substance", first at Nicaea in 325 to Christ and afterwards at Constantinople in 381/2 to the whole Trinity. The further elaboration of the doctrine was the working out of the implications of the dogma. Obviously, the emphasis of the dogma is upon the unity of God: what the *Homo-ousios* asserts is not the distinction of the Persons but the one-ness of being. But God reveals his being in his works: the activity of God in creation and redemption, what he *does*, is the expression of what he *is*: the one-ness of his being implies the one-ness of his operation. If then in each Person of the Trinity there is the fullness of God's being, there can be no act of God which is not the act of all three Persons: *Opera Trinitatis ad extra indivisa sunt*. The doctrine of the Trinity cannot *mean*, either that God is Power, Wisdom, and Love (or any other triad of attributes), or that creation, redemption, and sanctification have separate agents in the three Persons of the Godhead. The only difference between the Persons is the difference in the relations in which they stand to one another; and about that we have no light but what is reflected from the Names given to them in Scripture: the Father, from whom are all things, the Son, Word and Image of the Father, through whom are all things, and the Spirit, Gift of both, in whom are all things.

The dogma, as defined, stops there; and no further development of doctrine can *claim* acceptance. Augustine, followed by the Schoolmen, takes the Biblical conception of man's making in the image of God to justify his psychological analogy of the human Ego and its three-fold life. Some modern theologians are prepared to take the word Person in a sense in which it was not originally applied, and to defend a view of the Trinity as a divine Society on the ground that personality implies reciprocity, and that the God who is Love is imaged for us in the human family rather than in the human individual. But all such teachings remain speculative unless they can show that no *other* doctrine is compatible with the dogma.

The defence of the dogma, as we have seen, can properly rest upon the Biblical revelation.

I have tried to suggest, in this example, the sort of connecting lines that *may* be traced between the New Testament as we read it to-day, and the dogmatic orthodoxy of the Ecumenical Councils of the Church; and I believe it would be possible to show similar lines of connection in the case of other doctrines. If our modern understanding of the central message of the New Testament, which we call the Gospel, is reached by methods of interpretation different from those employed in the Church of the Fathers, it is equally true that we find ourselves compelled to interpret the Church's doctrinal formulations in terms which would have been impossible for the Fathers themselves. If we no longer believe that the writers of the New Testament were exempt from the human liability to error, we can hardly be disposed to claim such exemption for the theologians of the fourth century. Yet we may still believe that in the fourth century as in the first, the Holy Spirit was bearing his witness through fallible men to the Christ in whom we have our knowledge of God. The guidance of the Holy Spirit is not indeed to be identified with the *communis sensus fidelium*, to which Christian doctrine has always had to commend itself. That "common sense" is based still, as it always was, in part on familiarity with the text of Scripture, and in part on the practice of common worship and devotion. Doctrine now as always must keep in touch with both if it is to serve not only for the intellectual satisfaction of the learned but for the edification of the Church. For it is through both, through the written word of the Bible and the spoken word of the worshipping community, that the Spirit can speak to every age in its own language of the wonderful works of God.

THE ATONEMENT AND THE SACRAMENTS

F. W. DILLISTONE

IN ANY consideration of the relation of the Atonement to the Sacraments we are bound to view it from a social rather than an individual point of view. The message of Atonement is of course directed towards the individual: it tells him that something has been done to change his condition of estrangement and to restore him to fellowship with God. The whole question of how the individual is affected in his innermost soul by the work of Christ is a vastly important one, and yet it is not the question which arises in relation to the Sacraments. For the Sacraments are primarily social institutions—corporate activities within the life of the Church. I recognize that there are varieties of interpretation when we come to consider the number or nature of the Sacraments. But in every part of Christendom where sacramental observances are to be found it is a social group that is involved, and this social group is normally related through the sacramental rite either to certain elements within the natural order or to certain structures within the temporal order. Thus, in thinking of the Atonement and the Sacraments, we are bound to take into account the relation of Christ's work of Atonement to a society rather than to an individual and to that society as it is sacramentally related both to the order of nature and to the order of time. To put it quite simply the question before us is: How does the work of Christ affect men in their relation to the created order and to the historic order: and how is this effect realized or transmitted or expressed in the sacramental rites of the Church? This question has been answered in a variety of ways and I shall attempt to classify these variations to the best of my ability.

My first and main division is between those traditions which have laid the greater emphasis on man's relatedness to the *natural* order of things, to the stuff of which his universe is made, to the constitution of his own body, to the processes of eating and drinking

and washing and planting and gathering and shaping—in all of which man is dealing with substances found in his *natural* environment: and those traditions which have laid the greater emphasis on man's relatedness to the *temporal* order of things, to his own movements in time, to notable events such as victory in battle, deliverance from danger, birth and death, separation and meeting, in all of which man comes to terms with soul-shaking situations in his *historical* environment.

My second and in a sense correlative division is between those traditions whose major concern is with questions of being, essential structure, physical substance, aesthetic form, and those whose primary attention is given to questions of action, effective instrumentality, physical change, and ethical pattern. It would be difficult if not impossible to find a society in which one or other of these emphases had gained an *exclusive* attention and control. But that one or the other tends to predominate in any given social group and thereby to affect both its philosophical outlook and its sacramental institutions seems to me clear. And this means that the effect of the work of Christ on man's existence in space and time and the expression of this effect in sacramental forms is likely to be set forth within a general framework in which nature or history, being or action, prove to be the formative and even determinative categories. Let us then look at a few examples of the way in which this has proved to be the case.

I

Let us begin with an ancient writer whose treatise on the work of Christ is as well-known as any. In the *De Incarnatione* St Athanasius launches at once into a discussion of the created order, of man's existence, of his bodily form, and of the blissful immortality which had been intended for him. All this is related to the Divine Word who is present in the whole and in every part of the Divine creation. But man's disobedience results in a state where a new law operates—the law of death and corruption; man having originally been brought from non-existence to being is now slipping back from being to non-existence. How can this state of affairs be changed and the process reversed? Only by a new entrance of the Word into our world. The incorporeal and incorruptible Word takes to himself a body capable of death and surrenders it to death in order that His death in the body might actually fulfil the death

of all mankind and that his resurrection as Son of God might put an end to the corruption of all.[1]

This is Athanasius's essential schema, although he also approaches his subject from another angle showing that man's ignorance and blindness could only be overcome by a new revelation of the Image of God in mankind. This revelation took place in every dimension—even in Hades through his death—so that all things have now been filled with the knowledge of God. But this second approach is not as determinative for his thought as is the first. For him the all important matter is that essential being was deformed and needed to be re-fashioned, and that this re-fashioning actually took place in the whole domain of human nature through the entrance into it of the Word. By his human life, which was constantly being re-inforced and even transcended by the power of the life of the immortal Son of God; by his human death, which was even at the moment of its consummation being reversed by the resurrection-life of the Divine, the Word restored to health the thing that he had formed; the created order, and humanity in particular, had been renewed and the Divine Image had been reformed in mankind.

In all this schema the time-element is scarcely in view. It is not entirely excluded. There is a certain sense of before Christ and after Christ, a slight reference to the first coming and the second coming, a faint recognition of a historical movement in the actual life of the incarnate Christ. But in the main we move in an atmosphere where temporal categories are of little account. The created order and the existence of mankind within it are to be regarded as forming a unified whole. The particular entrance of the Word into it is to be regarded as directly affecting the whole. To reverse the corruption of death and to re-inject the vitality of incorruptible life is a virtually timeless process. Again, the ethical

1 "Thus, taking a body like our own, because all our bodies were liable to the corruption of death, He surrendered His body to death instead of all, and offered it to the Father. This He did out of sheer love for us, so that in His death all might die, and the law of death thereby be abolished because, having fulfilled in His body that for which it was appointed, it was thereafter voided of its power for men. This He did that He might turn again to incorruption men who had turned back to corruption, and make them alive through death by the appropriation of His body and by the grace of His resurrection. Thus He would make death to disappear from them utterly as straw from fire." (*De Incarnatione* 34.)

receives only a very minor treatment. It too is not entirely excluded. There is the reference to the Transgression, the sacrifice to free man from the primal transgression, the renunciation of adultery, murder, and avarice which comes about through the activity of the living Christ. But in the main the interest is in life, wholeness, re-creation, purity of worship, essential being, rather than in the categories belonging to the moral struggle and social ethics.

Such a schema is bound to work itself out in a particular form of sacramental teaching and observance. When the renewal of the created order and the re-invigoration of humanity are regarded as the very essence of atonement, the re-presentation of this schema will inevitably constitute the very essence of the sacraments. In point of fact this can come to expression in one of two ways. The seven sacraments may be regarded as necessary parts of a single sacramental whole which is concerned with the renewal of life or of humanity in all its aspects. Alternatively the seven may be viewed as finding their coherence and their fulfilment in the one central sacrament—the Eucharist—which is the all-inclusive representation of the renewal of creation by the Word of God. At every Eucharist a cosmic situation is framed in which the time-element plays little part: the process of paramount importance is the coming of the Divine Word into the created order represented by the Eucharistic elements, into the human order represented by the worshippers. Through the coming of the Word into life, death, and resurrection—all of which elements of his incarnate existence have their place within the liturgy—the wholeness of life is re-created and the perfection of true knowledge is again made manifest. Historical and ethical results may follow. But a view of atonement which embraces being and the created order and humanity and finds their re-integration through the revelation of the Word in human form and in bodily death will naturally lead on to a view of the sacraments which embraces the elements of the created order (bread, wine, water, oil, etc.) and the basic processes of human existence (birth, eating, drinking, puberty, marriage, reproduction) and finds their principle of re-integration in the constant re-presentation of the manifestation of the Word in physical and bodily ways.

The most obvious illustration of the views of Atonement and Sacraments which I have just described may be found in the teach-

ing and practice of the Eastern Orthodox Church from the time of Athanasius to the present. But it would not be difficult to find modern examples amongst Anglican theologians who, although influenced in certain respects by the historic and psychological considerations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, yet have remained true to the general framework of thought belonging to an earlier age. I think in particular of two great books—Moberly's *Atonement and Personality* and Quick's *The Christian Sacraments*. In each the Atonement is viewed as a manifestation upon the plane of this world of what is in fact a timeless movement in the Eternal Life, an essential principle of the Eternal Order. Atonement is life through death, gain through loss, fruitfulness through sacrifice. And it follows with complete naturalness that this process is continued in the life of Christ's body the Church. Through sacramental forms and processes this eternal Atonement is mediated to and experienced upon the plane of the created order which, of course, includes created humanity. Humanity is re-created and restored, and by sacramental means the very life of the reconciling Christ is incorporated within a new humanity. In Christ, a new creation. Old things have passed away: all things have become new. And all things are derived from God who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ.

2

Let us now look at the other side, the view of the Atonement and Sacraments in which action, historical change, ethical re-orientation are the dominant categories. To find any clear-cut expression of this point of view in the ancient world after New Testament times is quite impossible. Nor is it possible in the medieval world where in spite of threats of change and upheaval men still believed it possible to view their universe and humanity as belonging to a firmly established Divine order. Even the Reformation, though it brought a vast new emphasis upon revolutionary change and upon moral categories, yet retained the general world-view which Christendom had taken over from the Graeco-Roman civilization, a world-view in which the natural order and human nature were regarded as having come ready-made as it were from the hand of God, as having been defaced and despoiled by the Fall, and as having been redeemed and restored by the work of Christ. It is true that the focus of interest now tended to be man himself rather than his natural environment:

his place in God's purpose, his defection, his responsibility, his salvation, his sanctification. And as a corollary it followed that the natural order in general and the sacramental order in particular came to be viewed more as instruments by which God supported and sustained his people than as parts of one single order of creative life in which humanity was included. In other words, the over-all structure of the natural order and the question of its re-integration became of receding interest and importance. Men were concerned to find out how they were to be assured of acceptance by their Divine Over-Lord, how they were to obey him in their life in society, and how the physical world was to be brought into the service of their needs, both naturally and sacramentally.

In all this one word came to occupy an ever-increasing significance. It was the word "faith". Through faith men were to receive the benefits made available for them through the work of Christ. These benefits might be mediated to them through the Word of the Gospel or through the Sacraments of the Gospel. In any case it was the Gospel embodying God's Promise that was of supreme importance, it was through faith alone that the benefits embodied in the Gospel could be actually received. It is not surprising that man became less concerned about the elements that were actually used in the sacramental actions. The all-important matter was to be faithful to the means of grace ordained by God and to receive in faith the benefits that he through them was ready to bestow. Thus the Atonement was viewed as a transaction made once for all at the centre of time by God through the mediation of Christ for the benefit of mankind: the Sacraments were viewed as "holy ordinances instituted by Christ in his Church to signify, seal and exhibit unto those that are within the covenant of grace the benefits of his mediation, to strengthen and increase their faith . . . to oblige them to obedience and to testify and cherish their love and communion one with another". Essentially the Atonement was viewed as a saving work, the Sacraments as signs and seals of that saving work to the Christian community as it extended its range in space and time.

What the Reformers were not aware of and could not be expected to be aware of were, on the one hand, the approaching changes in the whole structure of man's world-view—changes which were to affect his views of nature, of human nature, and of super-nature—and, on the other hand, the approaching changes in

the structure of his time-perspective—changes which were to affect his views of world-history, of human history, and of salvation-history. These were the shattering changes which were about to come through the rise of modern science and through the new methods of historical investigation. By reason of these revolutionary changes new interpretations of the Atonement and Sacraments, in their cosmic and historical aspects, were bound sooner or later to emerge. In actual fact the cosmic re-interpretations have been exceedingly slow to appear, though there have been movements in this direction on the part of certain Roman theologians and within Anglicanism the work of Thornton and Mascall is particularly worthy of mention.

But it is the new interest in historical method and interpretation which has so far had much the greater impact on the Christian Church particularly in Reformed circles. From the time of the late Middle Ages the nations of northern Europe have been aware of a sense of destiny, of being on the move, of an involvement in an age-long drama of history, and it was this which made them so ready to respond to the new impact of the book of salvation-history which was opened up to them in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. They could appreciate in a new way the meaning of a transaction which had revolutionized man's situation in history and the importance of ordinances which could transmit the benefits of that transaction to successive generations of mankind. But having once embraced temporal and historical frameworks and categories they were the more open to the effects of the changes within those frameworks and categories. The nineteenth century, with its enthusiasm for history and yet its ever-growing emphasis upon the need for the most rigorous application of critical method and for the most searching examination of all claims to historical particularity, began to affect men's outlook on the Atonement as well as on the Sacraments which mediated its benefits into man's historical existence. Could it be that Atonement was simply a process within human history, man's gradual reconciliation to his natural and social environment in time? Could it be that the Sacraments were nothing more than *rites de passage*, symbols expressing the reconciliation between man and the critical historical situations which he was bound to encounter in his journey through life? This was the general interpretation towards which nineteenth century Liberalism was trending, and it is not surprising that certain Re-

formed theologians began to recoil with horror from an interpretation which seemed to evacuate the doctrines both of the Atonement and of the Sacraments of all their power and meaning.

A notable example of this recoil, and a brilliant one, may be found in the writings of P. T. Forsyth. His teaching may be briefly summarized by saying that for him the whole virtue of the Atonement was focused and concentrated in one single Act, an act in history, a moral act. Forsyth was not lacking in interest in aesthetic form and in the transformation of being: in fact I incline to wonder whether his own natural leanings towards the very emphases which figure so prominently in the Catholic tradition did not make him the more violent in his reaction against them in his own theological teaching. Be that as it may, he returns again and again to the one saving Act, the reconciliation of the world once for all in the *opus operatum* of the Cross, the final creation of a new Humanity, the moral sacrifice of Christ, the great compendious act of the Cross. And equally he comes again and again to the Sacraments as acts of the Church, as great confessional acts of worship, as serving and conveying the saving work of Christ, as acting upon the Church to effect moral regeneration. "In Baptism", he writes, "the Church gathers all together into one basal act, corresponding to the forgiveness and reconciliation of the world once for all in the Cross." The Lord's Supper is "the Church rising with its Lord to the height of *action*—active reception of His gift who is acting in its midst with the utmost that God could do".

Forsyth made a magnificent protest against the dangers towards which he saw that the Liberalism of his day was moving. Historical relativism he opposed by an uncompromising affirmation of a unique act at the centre of history giving meaning to the whole: ethical relativism he opposed by his reiterated emphasis upon an all-inclusive act of moral decision. Further he opposed all forms of mystical pietism by his call to engage in objective acts of sacramental worship: he opposed all forms of humanistic meliorism by his call to receive in humble penitence the grace made available through the time honoured Sacraments of the Gospel. It was a magnificent protest but it did not really come to grips with the new world of space-time into which the twentieth century was bringing us. Forsyth could see clearly enough that an extreme Liberalism had no real place either for Atonement or Sacraments. He was not, I think, able to give to the Church a richly positive view of the

Atonement and Sacraments such as would help it to relate the Christ and his atoning work to the natural and social environment of its own day. To narrow the interpretation down to the language of moral act, holy judgement, confessional act, active reception, is to bring these doctrines within too limited a compass. Something more is needed if the Church is to speak with power into the general situation of the twentieth century.

3

Let me try in conclusion to outline some of the factors that must be taken into account in seeking to relate the work of Christ to the created order and the historic order as man understands them to-day: and to express this relation in and through the sacramental rites of the Church. First the created order. We have become aware in this century as never before of the universe as a single living wholeness—probably to call it a vast organism is as good a description as any. It may be regarded as expanding, as infinite, as being continuously created, but, whatever it is, it is an interlocking unity in which the tiniest event anywhere or at any time can as it were send an infinitesimal shudder through the whole. This is true even of an event which is within the interior organic life of the given whole. How much more must it be true of an event which impinges upon the world-organism from beyond itself—and unless one can use the conception of the "beyond" it is pointless to speak of God or the Divine. If a new principle of life *from beyond* did in fact enter this space-time universe it was bound to set in motion waves of force stretching out to its very limits. But more. If this incapsulated life succeeded in reversing what must otherwise be regarded as an inexorable law of the whole—the law of dissolution, decay, and death—then again the effects must be felt in every part of the universal organism.

But the question then arises: How can it be known that such a radical event has taken place and how are its effects manifested? The Christian answers that there were in fact *witnesses* of the Resurrection, men who saw with their eyes, etc. (1 John 1), and that through certain space-time media the effects of the Resurrection are mediated to successive generations of humanity. How far it can be claimed that the death-and-resurrection in the flesh affects the cosmos as such I find it difficult to say—though I doubt if the New Testament witness to the reconciliation of the cosmos is to be

understood in purely eschatological terms. Again, how far it can be claimed that the death-and-resurrection of the Incarnate Word affects humanity quite apart from any conscious or willed response on its part is also difficult to say—though if there can be any sense in viewing humanity as a whole then it seems to be clear that we can speak of the wholeness of human life having been affected. But leaving aside these difficult questions it is at least possible to affirm that through sacramental media the new life which has passed through death is transmitted to ever widening circles of humanity in space and time, and that as men lay hold of this life through a process of response which gathers up the wholeness of their essential being they are themselves integrated into the new Humanity which has come into existence through the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Christ.

But this is not the only way of looking at things. There is the historical order—an order which men have come to view increasingly in dialectical terms, an order in which a thrust in one direction is countered by a thrust in the opposite direction, leading ultimately to a situation which may be one of exhaustion but may under certain conditions contain the potential of creative social renovation. What the principle is which distinguishes between these two possibilities may be hard to discern, but the Christian will have little hesitation in seeing it summarized in the words of Jesus: "He that saveth his life shall lose it."

If, now, this is true of history in general it can be claimed all the more confidently that when there was a unique ingression into history from the side of the Divine, the Good, the All-loving, there was bound to be from the other side a resistance to the uttermost from the demonic, the evil, the all-destroying. Yet out of this clash, the Christian goes on to claim, a Spirit came in power, the Holy Spirit, which now could operate in a new way in history, ever initiating movements in the pattern of the career of the Son of God, ever gaining new victories at the points where resistance had reached its maximum force and effect. How far history as such, the over-all history of humanity, has been effected by the entrance into history of the Incarnate Son of God cannot, so far as I can see, be assessed in any definitive way. But it is at least possible to affirm that whenever the pattern of his coming is re-enacted, either in concrete historical event or in dramatically symbolic way, new energies are released which give a foretaste of the ultimate

reconciliation which the Christian believes to be the goal of the whole movement of human history.

I have said nothing of the subjective response of the individual either to the Atonement in general or within the sacraments in particular. My object has rather been to sketch a view of the way in which the work of Christ has effected both the created order and the historical order and how this effect is transmitted through or re-enacted in the sacramental rites of the Church. One supreme difficulty as it seems to me is that, whereas an informed scientist or historian might be prepared to give ear to the view of the universe and of history that I have sketched, it would be very difficult to win any hearing for it from those whose view of the universe and of history are governed by exclusively materialistic and mechanistic laws. I do not believe that either the Atonement or the Sacraments can be expressed in materialistic or mechanistic terms without doing despite to their essential truth. Perhaps we can only seek to be faithful to the best and the truest that we know, trusting that in God's good time the materialistic will become less gross and the mechanistic less rigid, and that the Spirit will again have free course to take of the things of Christ and reveal them to men.

SAINT MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

F. P. HARTON

IT IS by one of the strange accidents of history that Saint Maximus the Confessor has for long been well-nigh forgotten by theologians. This is perhaps not so surprising amongst ourselves, since our interest in the early Church usually ends abruptly about A.D. 451 and, whilst we make an exception in favour of Gregory the Great, the savageries of the sixth and seventh centuries and the tortuous subtleties of monophysites, monenergites, and monothelites make the post-Chalcedonian period barren and distasteful. It is rather more surprising that Maximus has also been largely neglected on the Continent, yet so it is, for a mere handful of scholars have worked on him and the results of their researches, often of great interest, have been largely confined to articles in learned periodicals and works of reference. Recently, however, Maximus has found his Boswell in America in the person of Dom Polycarp Sherwood, O.S.B., S.T.D., a monk of St Meinrad Archabbey and Professor of Patrology in the Pontifical Institute of St Anselm in Rome, the latest of whose works on the Confessor has been published in this country.[1]

This important work repays careful study, but Dom Polycarp, whose learning is immense, has no mercy on his reader. His introduction (which is rather to the whole Maximus than merely to two short works of his) makes heavy going for the scholar, especially if he dutifully turns up all the notes (of which there are no less than 864), many of which are but references to works not in this volume; while the patristic amateur, for whom this series is also intended, will certainly give up in despair and bewilderment before long. Nevertheless he who perseveres will be repaid, and these texts of Maximus are of considerable interest to the student of ascetical and mystical theology. It is not my purpose to presume to criticize the editor but to try and sketch something of the interest and importance of the Confessor himself.

[1] *St Maximus the Confessor, The Ascetic Life and Four Centuries on Charity*, Translated and Annotated by Polycarp Sherwood, O.S.B., S.T.D. *Ancient Christian Writers*, No. 21, ed. Quasten and Plumpe.

Maximus was a man of considerable culture, who would be outstanding in any age, and one of the most penetrating theologians and profound mystics that the Greek Church has produced. Born in Constantinople in 580 of an aristocratic family, he received the higher education usual for those intended for the Imperial service, by which, like St Augustine before him, he became early acquainted with Aristotle and Neoplatonism, a grounding in philosophy which was to stand him in good stead later.

His career began as far from monasticism as can well be imagined, for in 610 Heraclius became Emperor and made him his First Secretary. This appointment can hardly have been entirely due to parental influence, for Maximus must have been a remarkably brilliant young man to attain so important a position at the early age of thirty, and a great future seemed to lie before him.

The Court, however, could not hold him for long, and after only three or four years he crossed the Bosphorus and became a simple monk in the monastery of Chrysopolis, the modern Scutari. The circumstances which led him to make so drastic a change of life are unknown, but love of God and the hidden life must certainly have been his motives. A monk he became and a monk he remained, though he might well have attained the episcopate. Contemporary writers often refer to him as Abbot, but he never was an abbot in the sense of superior of a monastery, the title being a purely honorary one, as was not rare at that time.

The next ten years or so were given to prayer and study but that was not to last undisturbed. This was the period of the Persian conquests and the monophysite ascendancy; province after province was lost to the Empire. Syria, Asia Minor, Palestine and, finally, Egypt were conquered, and monophysites, as opponents of the Empire, were everywhere put in power at the expense of the orthodox, so that by 620 Chalcedon seems hardly to have had any adherents in the Persian provinces.

About 624 Maximus left Chrysopolis for the monastery of St George at Cyzicus (Erdek) where he composed his first writings, which were a refutation of Origenism. He did not, however, remain here for more than a year or two, for, in 626, the Avars in a combined attack with the Persians menaced Constantinople itself, and Maximus went oversea to Africa, where he entered the monastery of Eucratas of which Sophronius was abbot.

It is wonderful to see how God orders the lives of those who are

sufficiently humble to allow him to do so, and this move of Maximus to a new home was clearly ordered by divine Providence, for it brought together in the closest relationship the only two men who were fitted to make a theological defence of orthodoxy in the troublous times ahead, and initiated a partnership which was to last until the death of Sophronius left Maximus to bear the burden alone.

By 629 Heraclius had regained control of the lost provinces and found himself confronted with the intractable problem of uniting orthodox and monophysite, which a century or so of persecution had done nothing to solve. Here Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, came to his aid.

Sergius, though himself orthodox, was more of a statesman than a churchman, and his primary aim was to assist Heraclius to consolidate the Empire. He therefore sought a compromise with a theory which he had been quietly canvassing for some time, which he believed would be accepted, though in different senses, by both monophysite and orthodox.

This theory, known as monenergism, was speciously simple, merely that in Christ there was but one source of action (*energeia, operatio*). This is explained to the orthodox as meaning that the single source of action in Christ was that of the single Person active in the two natures, while to the monophysites it was clearly the single will of the single nature, the sacred humanity having been absorbed in the *Logos*. Each side could therefore, as he thought, justify the new theory in accordance with its own views, St Leo, St Cyril, and Chalcedon being quietly dropped.

This notion was a godsend to the Emperor, who accepted it joyfully and it first emerged as an instrument of policy in the hands of Cyrus of Phasis.

This Cyrus, a monophysite, was elected to the orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria in 633, and Egypt was a good place in which to try out the new idea. He therefore immediately set to work and called a conference of orthodox and monophysites who produced an Act of Union on the basis of monenergism in that same year.

Probably both Sergius and Cyrus believed that it would be possible to effect an universal and lasting union on the basis of equivocal terminology, but there were those on the orthodox side who saw the underlying threat and, being more concerned with theological truth than with political expediency, came into active

opposition; the most important of these was Sophronius, with whom was Maximus.

Sophronius' first moves were hardly encouraging. He began by trying to bring Cyrus round to orthodoxy without success and subsequently made an equally unsuccessful journey to Constantinople to do the like for Sergius who, equally unsuccessfully, tried to persuade him to keep silence about the one or two wills in Christ and to content himself with defending the two natures.

The interview was thus abortive, and it is unfortunate that old age and the Arab invasions prevented Sophronius from going on to Rome; had he done so monothelitism might have been nipped in the bud before the Emperor actively entered the fray. Something, however, was about to happen which radically altered the situation, for, when he arrived in Palestine on his way home, Sophronius was unexpectedly elected Patriarch of Jerusalem; Sergius was no longer dealing with a simple monk.

Sophronius wasted no time in bringing the authority of his new office to bear upon the defence of Chalcedonian orthodoxy. It was customary for a Patriarch on enthronization to send a synodal letter to all other Patriarchs, and Sophronius' letter was a clear-cut definition of the orthodox faith and a condemnation of heresy.

This was the first broadside against monthelitism; it was not, however, the first document to reach Rome, for hardly had Sophronius attained the Patriarchate than Sergius, in an effort to forestall him, wrote to Pope Honorius, seeking to enlist him, and with him the western Church, on the side of monothelitism, or at least to secure his silence.

Honorius, being quite unversed in the subtleties of the eastern mind, did not perceive that this apparently innocent recommendation really covered a monothelite interpretation of the Fathers, and the idea of silence on current controversy appealed to his Roman conservatism; consequently he failed to grasp the point at issue. He replied immediately, heartily commending Sergius' plan and, having in the meanwhile received Sophronius' synodal letter, wrote again to the same effect, adding that he had imposed silence on both Sophronius and Cyrus. It is easy to understand how the Pope was misled by Sergius' letter, but how he could have remained so simple-minded after hearing from Sophronius is a mystery. His own Christology was probably orthodox (he and Sergius were in fact dealing with different things) and his apologists, beginning with

Pope John IV, claim that he was not himself heretical, but that did not prevent him from being posthumously anathematized by both the Third Council of Constantinople and Pope Leo II. Whatever may be said about him, there is no doubt that his letters were an enormous encouragement to the monothelites, a strong support to the Byzantine policy for the next forty years, and a severe blow to the orthodox. In the Council of 680, monothelites still appealed to his authority in support of their opinions.

Battle was now joined, and the next move came from the Emperor, who in 638 promulgated an edict, the *Ecthesis*, asserting monothelitism (no longer monenergism) as the official doctrine of the Church, which profession of faith had been suggested to him some time previously by Sergius in the *Psephos*.

Now, within the next four years, the stage was cleared of all its principal actors: Heraclius, Sergius, Cyrus, Honorius,and Sophronius were all dead, and the Christian East was gone too on the completion of the Mohammedan conquest with the fall of Alexandria. One would have hoped that peace might have come to the Church, but that was not to be; the Empire remained and monothelitism with it, orthodoxy proscribed and the orthodox persecuted. The defence of Chalcedon passed to Rome and Maximus.

Early in 640 Severinus, being raised to the papacy, sent apocrisiaries, as was customary, to obtain the imperial confirmation of his election; they were required to sign the *Ecthesis*, which they refused to do, merely undertaking to present it to the Pope. Severinus, however, died before any action could be taken.

Heraclius seems to have been somewhat shaken by the Roman attitude and actually wrote to Severinus' successor, John IV, disclaiming responsibility for the *Ecthesis* and naming Sergius as the *fons et origo malis*; nevertheless he did nothing, and the Pope subsequently wrote to his successors, Constantine III and Heracleonas, demanding its revocation and endeavouring to clear Honorius from all complicity with the heresy.

Under John's successor, Theodore, matters worked up to a crisis. This Pope condemned the *Ecthesis* as his predecessor had done, but went further and sent to the Patriarch Paul of Constantinople a declaration of the true faith to be promulgated in its place. This the Patriarch refused to do; he was excommunicated and the Pope ordered his deposition. This was not done; on the contrary the

incensed Patriarch persuaded the young Emperor, Constans II, to issue a new edict, the *Type*, making the profession of orthodoxy a criminal offence. All discussion of matters of faith was forbidden, bishops and clerics who defied the edict were to be degraded, monks expelled from their monasteries, nobles dispossessed, and ordinary citizens flogged and exiled.

This was a savage and direct challenge not only to the faithful but to the Pope himself, who was then Martin I.

Martin made no attempt to obtain imperial confirmation of his election but summoned a Council at the Lateran to defend the Faith, which was attended by a hundred and fifty bishops. This Council anathematized the *Type* and its promoters and laid down that in Christ "there are two natural wills, the divine and the human, and two natural operations, the divine and the human". The decisions of this Council were sent to every part of the Church, west as well as east, and local Councils were called to meet and support them.

Martin was a brave man, for he must have foreseen what would happen and must have well known how completely he was in the power of the Emperor, whose character he also knew.

Constans took up the challenge with his accustomed savagery and sent a high official to Rome to compel the recalcitrant Pope and Bishops to accept the *Type* by force, but clergy and people were too closely united for his mission to be a success and his troops were helpless, so, after an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate the Pope, the messengers withdrew.

In 653 another envoy arrived in Rome with an imperial decree, notifying Martin that he was deposed and ordering his immediate arrest and despatch to Constantinople. He suffered the utmost brutality from the soldiers before he reached the Bosphorus, there he was imprisoned, tortured, given the cruel farce of a state trial for treason, publicly degraded, and exiled to the Crimea, where he died of his sufferings within six months. So the execrable Constans had his revenge, but orthodoxy was not dead, for Maximus lived and remained the indomitable champion of the orthodox faith.

The controversy with Pyrrhus was a turning point in his life. This Pyrrhus had succeeded Sergius as Patriarch of Constantinople but fell foul of the Emperor and was dethroned, not for heresy but for political reasons, and forced to fly to Africa in 641. He still remained a monothelite. Pope Theodore regarded him as the author of the *Ecthesis* and insisted on his canonical deposition for heresy,

requiring that he be sent to Rome and adding that he should not be allowed to retain the patriarchal title of "Most Holy", to which he continued to lay claim. Maximus, who seems to have been now in touch with Rome, took the same line and urged him to make his peace with Rome as representing the whole Church.

In 645 Maximus held a public disputation with Pyrrhus in the presence of the patrician Gregory and many bishops at Carthage, the records of which still exist and are an important witness to the opposing theologies. Maximus succeeded in converting Pyrrhus to the orthodox faith, and soon afterwards they both went to Rome, Pyrrhus to make his recantation (though unfortunately he later recanted once more and was excommunicated) and Maximus to defend the Faith by conversation, treatises, and letters, and to develop fully the orthodox doctrine of the wills and operations of Christ. Here his influence was immense, and he was the theologian of the Lateran Council of 649 whose canons constantly use his terminology and maintain his doctrine.

Pope Martin was arrested in 653, and in the same year the Imperial authorities seized his adviser, probably the only person of whose influence they were afraid, and carried him too to Constantinople. Like the Pope he refused to subscribe the *Type* and in 655 he was tried (the records of the trial are still in existence) and exiled with his two disciples and friends, Anastasius the apocrisiary and Anastasius the monk. Their conversion to heresy would have been a signal triumph for their adversaries, who kept them in exile for seven years hoping thereby to break their spirit. This, however, did not happen, so they were brought to trial for the second time and were condemned to be scourged and to have their tongues and hands cut off, after which they were returned to exile in the Caucasus, where Maximus died, worn out by his sufferings on 13 August 662.

So perished Maximus, a "strong, pure light of faith and charity, of orthodoxy and contemplation", but the victory did not lie with the Emperor, for it was Maximus's doctrine that prevailed at the third Council of Constantinople which in 681 extinguished monothelitism and brought the Empire back to the orthodox faith.

THE PROBLEM OF THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS

L. W. BARNARD

I. AUTHORSHIP AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

WE DO not know who wrote the tract known as the Epistle of Barnabas which is usually classed with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers of the Church. It is universally agreed that the author was not the Apostle of the same name, although Clement of Alexandria thought so; no Apostle (not even St Paul) would have said that the Jewish *torah* was a deception of an evil spirit. It is probable that the epistle originated in Alexandria, to judge by the writer's fondness for the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures—a method which he may have inherited from Alexandrian Hellenistic Judaism where it had reached its zenith in the writings of Philo. This *venue* would also account for the epistle's later popularity in Egypt; Origen refers to it as "the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas" and the Codex Sinaiticus of the fourth century places it immediately after the Book of Revelation and before the Shepherd of Hermas. The West, however, never regarded it as canonical.

When we come to the question of date, very different answers have been given by the commentators, and the reason lies in the obscurity of the so-called historical allusions in the epistle. We must therefore see if the general situation implied in the writing can be fitted into any known period of Egyptian Judaism and Christianity. It is certain that this is a tract for the times; a Jewish-Christian community somewhere or other was in great danger of falling back into Judaism, and perhaps news of this imminent defection had been brought to Alexandria by travellers. Thus Barnabas exhorts his readers to remain faithful to their Christian faith: "I urge this further counsel upon you: keep watch over yourselves now and do not imitate certain people by heaping sin after sin upon yourselves and saying: 'Their covenant is ours also'." (4. 6.) Where and when were this Christian community who lived in close contact with

Jews in existence? If Barnabas is writing from Alexandria—and we can think of no other suitable place—then this Jewish-Christian group must have been established elsewhere in Egypt. This is shown by the type of Judaism which appears in the tract—it was intensely ancestral and nationalistic rather than Alexandrian—and also by the author's own note:

> Now I am convinced and indeed fully conscious of the fact that since I spoke among you I have gained much experience because my travelling companion on the road to holiness has been the Lord. And so I too am altogether constrained to love you more than myself. Surely great faith and love, resting on the hope of his life, are present among you. Accordingly it occurs to me that if I should interest myself about you and share with you some portion of what I have received, my ministering to such spiritual persons would bring me a reward. I am taking pains therefore to send you a brief message so that in addition to your faith you may also possess perfect knowledge. (1. 4-5.)

This suggests that Barnabas at some time in the past had visited this Christian community and now longs to see them again (1. 3). We know from the papyri that there was constant contact between the metropolis and Middle and Upper Egypt for administrative and commercial reasons, and it is not improbable that Christianity at first was carried from Alexandria along these routes. Moreover the early Biblical and Christian papyrus texts which come mainly from Middle Egypt indicate that Christianity had reached that area by the second century A.D., which coheres with the general probability of an outward expansion of the faith from the Egyptian capital. We know too that Jewish communities were in existence in Middle Egypt from early times, e.g. at Arsinoë (the modern Fayum) and at Oxyrhynchus to the South, where a "Jews' lane" is mentioned. It is therefore perhaps not improbable that the Jewish-Christian community to whom Barnabas was writing was in existence somewhere in Middle Egypt in the second century of our era.

We may now look more closely at the internal evidence of the epistle. An older generation of scholars were fond of dating the tract just after the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 in the reign of Vespasian, taking as a starting point the cryptic allusion in 4. 4-5 to Daniel 7. 7-24:

> The final stumbling block has appeared of which, as Enoch says, the scripture speaks. Indeed it was for this reason that the Master

> has shortened the epochs and eras: He wants his Beloved to make haste and enter upon his inheritance! The prophet voices the same thought: "Ten Kingdoms will hold sway upon the earth, and after a little while a King will rise and at one blow humble three of the Kings". Daniel has similar things to say on the same subject: "And I saw the fourth beast—wicked and strong and more ferocious than all the other beasts of the sea, and how ten horns budded out from it, and out of these a small horn, a side-growth, and how this one subdued at one blow three large horns". Here then is something for you to understand.

The three Kings are supposed to be Vespasian and his two sons, and the blow is to be delivered by Nero appearing as Antichrist. However when it comes to working out the list of the ten Kingdoms difficulties arise as to whether Julius is to be included and Otho and Vitellius excluded. In fact very little can be made of this quotation; it is no clearer than the "historical allusions" of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which have produced a whole crop of dates some of them differing by as much as 200 years. Another significant fact is that Barnabas appears to quote St Matthew's Gospel, which implies that the first Gospel must have been known in Alexandria in his time; this could not have been much before the end of the first century allowing time for its arrival. Moreover in Barnabas 12. 7 the brazen serpent is used as a type of Christ which appears to be a reminiscence of John 3. 14 when we consider the infrequency of this particular typological interpretation in the early Fathers; it is likely that the fourth Gospel was known to our author. These considerations suggest that a date some decades later than A.D. 70 is more probable for our epistle's composition.

This is also I think indicated by the interesting passage 16. 1-5:

> But I will also tell you how those wretches erred in regard to the Temple when, instead of putting their trust in their God who had made them, they put it in the building as if it were the house of God! In fact they almost resembled the heathen in consecrating him by the Temple. But learn how the Lord speaks in superseding it: "Who has measured the heavens with the span of his hand, or the earth with the hollow of his palm? Have not I done it?" saith the Lord. "Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool. What house can you build for me, or what can be my resting place?" You know that their hope is in vain. Still further he says: "Behold the destroyers of this temple are the ones that will build it." This is actually being done. They were waging war and therefore it was demolished by the enemies;

> and now the subjects of the enemies are about to build it again. On the other hand it has been revealed that the city, the Temple, and the people of Israel are doomed! For the scripture saith: "And it will happen in the last days that the Lord will doom to destruction the flock of the pasture and the fold and their watchtower." And what the Lord says is as good as done.

This is a good example of Barnabas' anti-Temple polemic. The Jewish cultus is, in his view, as nothing, and it is idle for Jews (or for that matter Christians) to put their faith in it. To derive the sacredness of the temple from God is blasphemy—for in any case the whole cultus is doomed. Barnabas 16. 3-4 is a *crux interpretum* and has given rise to various conjectures. In our view the most satisfactory solution is to see here a reference to the Romans, who destroyed the temple in A.D. 70, and who are now thinking of rebuilding it with the help of their subjects the Palestinian Jews. This surely refers to the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117-32) who inaugurated a more lenient policy towards the Jews; we know too that one of this Emperor's interests was exotic architecture. After the terrible conflict between Jews and Greeks in Alexandria and elsewhere in Egypt in the time of Trajan, Hadrian's predecessor, when Jewish losses were on a vast scale, this reversal of policy must have appeared of the greatest significance to Egyptian Judaism. Perhaps it re-kindled anew the nationalistic aspirations of some Jews and revived a hope for the re-building of the Jerusalem sanctuary. We know that many Egyptian Jews, especially in the country areas, still looked towards Jerusalem, hellenized though they were in many ways; their own replica of the temple at Leontopolis had been closed in A.D. 73. And to a Jewish-Christian community in Middle Egypt in close contact with these renewed Jewish hopes and far from the steadying influence of the Alexandrian Church such beliefs were a real stumbling block. Barnabas accordingly attempts to show the futility of this belief in the temple and the Old Testament revelation. His readers are not to say that the covenant of God with the Jews is theirs also (4. 6)—there is only one covenant—the covenant of Jesus in our hearts (4. 8); and in any case Judaism is totally doomed (16. 5). We have no means of knowing if these sweeping anti-Jewish arguments succeeded in convincing this Christian community; that there was a two-way traffic between Christianity and Judaism is by no means unlikely. The epistle is most probably to be dated between A.D. 117 and 132, and may have

originally consisted of Chapters 1-17, Chapters 18-21 being added by the author at a later date.

2. CHRISTIANITY IN THE EPISTLE

A cursory reading of the tract will show that Barnabas is not in the front rank as a Christian apologist. His failure to appeal to the life and example of Jesus—apart from the *imitatio Christi* of the Social Code in the two-ways section (19. 7) which is certainly based on an older oral tradition—is noticeable. The writer's allegorical use of the Septuagint is in line with much Alexandrian exegesis, and it is hard to believe that this made much impression on his readers unless they were adepts at Egyptian crossword puzzles. Barnabas is the inferior of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in logical thought. The Old Covenant is worthless in his eyes rather than, as for Hebrews, the shadow and preparation for the new and greater Covenant. However in considering Barnabas' anti-Jewish polemic we should make allowance for the situation of the Alexandrian Church in his day. We know that Gnostic tendencies early appeared in this Church and that the great heresiarchs Basilides and Valentinus were regarded as orthodox Christians. One feature of their systems was the disparagement of the God of the Jews and the Old Testament, and it is not impossible that Barnabas too was influenced by this attitude. Moreover the Jewish population of the metropolis had been almost wiped out in conflict with the Greek population only a few years earlier in Trajan's reign, and it is hard to believe that the Church did not also suffer at that time. Perhaps Barnabas had unhappy memories of that holocaust, which may account in part for his hatred of Judaism and all that it stood for. These political upheavals may have also given an edge to the writer's chiliastic and apocalyptic beliefs; these always tend to flourish in times of crisis. Barnabas himself makes no claim to be a teacher (1. 8)—perhaps he had in mind the prohibition of Matt. 23. 8—"Be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your teacher and all ye are brethren"; instead he writes to this community as one of them to suggest a few things to cheer them in their present difficult situation. Yet he reverenced the prophets and teachers of the past and present (1. 7, 2. 4), and in this he was following a well known Rabbinical principle. (Cf. T. B. Sanh. 110a: "He who disputes with his teacher is as if he disputed

with the Shekinah".) We may instance too the Qumran community's reverence for the Teacher of Righteousness as "the priest into whose heart God put wisdom to explain all the words of his servants the prophets, through whom God declared all the things that are coming upon his people and his congregation" (*Habakkuk Commentary* 1. 5). Barnabas is also keen that this Egyptian Jewish-Christian group should meditate on and study both the oral teaching given to them and the Christian writings in their possession (10. 11, 21. 1, 6).

Our author was an earnest Christian man. A warm humanity pervades his writing which is by no means an unattractive counterpart to his somewhat arid exegesis of the Old Testament. He addresses his readers as "sons and daughters" (1. 1., cf. 21. 9); he experienced "keen delight" when visiting this Church before (1. 3); our Lord is described as "the beloved Jesus" (4. 8); God's care is "our Father's kindly purpose" (2. 9); the true temple of God for the Christian is the heart of man (6. 15). Such phrases as these reveal the real man behind the exegete and apologist.

When we turn from Barnabas' Christianity to the type of Jewish-Christianity which our author was addressing we find various tendencies at work which we know from other sources early entered Egyptian Christianity. In 4. 10 Barnabas exhorts his readers "to detest utterly the practices of the Wicked Way. Do not shut yourselves up and court solitude as though your justification were already assured. On the contrary attend the common meetings and join in discussing what contributes to the common good". Several of the Church Fathers likewise tell their readers to attend Church regularly and so stifle heretical tendencies. Perhaps these Christians were fond of the ascetic and encratitic practices which are reflected in the Gospel according to the Hebrews known to Clement of Alexandria, which was certainly read in Egypt by Jewish-Christians. Have we here a glimpse of incipient Egyptian monasticism in Middle Egypt early in the second century A.D.? Whatever be the precise truth it is clear that there existed a tendency in this community to retire within itself and so forget its social responsibilities. Barnabas is obliged to remind some of these Christians of their duty . . . "I would exhort those who are in better circumstances, if you will accept my well-meant advice: you have in your community persons to whom you can do good; do not miss your opportunity" (21. 2)—advice which is strangely modern.

3. THE GENESIS OF THE TWO WAYS

Chapter 17 of the Epistle marks the end of the writer's somewhat wearisome argument. "So far as it was possible to give you a simple explanation, I sincerely trust I have, in keeping with my desire, omitted none of the things that have a bearing on salvation. For if I should write to you concerning things present or yet to come, you would not grasp them, because they are as yet hidden in parables: Let this then be enough." (17. 1, 2.) The author now passes to ethical instruction on the two ways of life required of Christians on which he considers it important to enlighten or remind his readers. "Let us now pass on to another kind of knowledge and instruction. There are two ways of instruction—as there are two powers—that of light and darkness. And there is a great difference between the two ways: the one is controlled by God's light-bringing angels, the other by angels of Satan. And as the latter is the Ruler of the present era of lawlessness, so the former is Lord from eternity to eternity." (18. 1, 2). The way of light is then described in detail:

> Love your Maker; reverence your Creator; glorify him who ransomed you from death; be single of heart and exuberant of spirit; do not associate with such as walk in the way of death; abhor everything unpleasing to God; hate every form of hypocrisy; do not by any means neglect the commandments of the Lord. Do not carry your head high but be always in a humble frame of mind; do not reach after personal glory; do not plot evil against your neighbour; do not open your heart to presumption. Abstain from fornication; do not commit adultery; do not practise corruption of youth; do not let the Word of God escape your lips in the presence of any that are impure. Make no distinction between one man and another when rebuking anyone's transgression. Be gentle, be quiet; with trembling treasure the instructions you have received. Do not bear malice against your brother. Do not waver in your decision. Do not take the name of the Lord in vain. Love your neighbour more than yourself. Do not kill a foetus by abortion or commit infanticide. Do not withdraw your hand from your son or your daughter; but from their youth teach them the fear of God. Do not covet your neighbour's goods; do not be greedy. Do not be on intimate terms with the powerful but associate with holy and lowly folk. Accept as blessings the troubles that come upon you, assured that nothing happens apart from God. Do not be double-minded or double-tongued, for the double-tongue is a deadly snare." (19. 2-7a.)

Inserted in this way of light is a social code governing the relationship between masters and slaves which is also to be found in the New Testament epistles and is based upon the *imitatio Christi* (19. 7b.). There follows further teaching about the sharing of private property and the duty of almsgiving with the command to "love as the pupil of your eye those who explain to you the Word of the Lord". (19. 9.) The way of light ends with a request to hold fast the traditions and to abstain from schism.

The way of darkness or of the Black One (20. 1) which is governed by Satan's angels contains a list of vices which, as we shall see, was a commonplace in the ethical instruction of the ancient world:

> In it is found everything that corrupts the souls of men: idolatry, rashness, the pomp of power, hypocrisy, double dealing, adultery, murder, robbery, pride, lawlessness, deceitfulness, malice, surliness, sorcery, magic, covetousness, lack of the fear of God. To this belong persecutors of the good, haters of the truth, lovers of falsehood; men who ignore the reward of right living being not devoted to what is good, or to just judgement; men who neglect widow and orphan, who are on the alert, not because they fear God but because they are bent upon vice; who are utter strangers to gentleness and patient endurance; men who love vanities and are fee hunters; who are heartless towards the poor, take no trouble about the oppressed, are prone to slander, do not know their Maker; murderers of children, destroyers of God's image; men who turn away from the needy, oppress the afflicted, act as counsel for the rich, are unjust judges of the poor; in a word—men who are sinners. (20. 1-2.)

The appearance of somewhat similar teaching about the two ways in the early Christian document known as the *Didache*, discovered in 1883 by Bryennios in the Jerusalem monastery of the Greek quarter of Constantinople, immediately led to the hypothesis that the authors of both Barnabas and the *Didache* were incorporating into their writings a Jewish manual which may have been originally used in the instruction of catechumens and proselytes. This view was ably championed by the Rabbinic scholars C. Taylor and G. Klein, who were able to cite numerous parallels to the two ways form of teaching in Jewish writings. However, a vigorous discussion has taken place during the last 30 years as to the literary relationship between Barnabas and the *Didache*, and it cannot be said that any agreed solution has as yet been found. On the one hand a group of scholars (Dom Connolly, Armitage Robinson, F. E.

Vokes, *inter alia*) have maintained that no Jewish manual of the two ways ever existed; Barnabas was the first to compose such teaching and the author of the *Didache* (whether second or third century A.D. or later) had Barnabas before him when composing his tract. The main argument of this "school"—if we may so designate them—is the alleged chaotic order of Barnabas' two ways section when compared with the more formal order of the *Didache*; the latter writer brought Barnabas' chaos into order and enlarged his two ways section with material from the Sermon on the Mount (*Did.* 1. 2-3), from Hermas and other writings, prefixing it to his treatise on Church Ordinances. Other scholars have been unconvinced by this rather tidy theory and have argued that Barnabas —who was a somewhat rambling writer—had the *Didache* before him when penning his epistle (thus Father Kleist, S.J., the latest commentator on these texts). It is difficult to see the force of either of these arguments; is Barnabas in fact as confused as these scholars imagine? Bishop Kirk saw long ago[1] that there was very little to choose between them, as both writers adapt their material freely in the "two ways" section and, as we should expect, their order varies as in the Matthaean and Lukan versions of the Q source in the Gospels. In the way of life section Barnabas tends to group his material around love to God, love to neighbour, and ecclesiastical responsibilities, with the Social Code interspersed between the first two, while the *Didache*, in this section, places the social code last, following a summary of the Decalogue, a meditation on the ten commandments, and a section on ecclesiastical responsibilities. In the way of death there is nothing to choose between the two authors. Both writers thus manipulate their material freely, although the frequent agreements in wording between the two strongly suggest that some sort of common material was in use. The fact that minute literary analysis has led to an impasse over this question suggests that another approach should be made, and it is here that we should like to call into account the evidence assembled by Dr E. G. Selwyn in Essay II appended to his great commentary on the *First Epistle of St Peter* (1947).

Dr Selwyn has shown by detailed study that behind the New Testament Epistles there lies the use of common catechetical or paraenetic material which circulated in the early Church in both oral and written form; this material was used by teachers and catechists and was adapted to different groups and occasions.

Certain of these forms which appear in the New Testament were used for ethical instruction and among them were the social code (*subiecti*) which governed relationships between the various classes of the community and a list of virtues and vices—and these also appear in Barnabas and the *Didache*. Another form of instruction was that of the "two ways" now under discussion, which, however, does not appear directly in the New Testament apart from the *verba Christi*: "Enter ye in by the narrow gate: for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction and many be they that enter in thereby. For narrow is the gate and straitened the way that leadeth unto life and few be they that find it" (Matt. 7. 13-14), although it is implied in the Gospel teaching about God and Mammon and in the accounts of our Lord's temptation. These three forms of ethical instruction were known both in the Graeco-Roman world and in Judaism prior to the Christian era, and it would seem that the problem of the relationship between the "two ways" section in Barnabas and the *Didache* can now be solved in the light of Dr Selwyn's investigations.

We know that certain Jewish rabbis set great store by the oral *torah*, and we can perhaps envisage an oral pattern of the two ways form of teaching which was adapted by various Rabbis in their instruction; sometimes it may have been written down in a set form. This background was inherited by Christianity in taking over Jewish catechetical forms for its own missionary purposes, and so behind the version of the two ways in Barnabas and the *Didache* and the original Jewish oral pattern may lie several written versions, not necessarily verbally identical, which were in use by catechists and teachers in different areas. The differences and the agreements between our two documents are best accounted for on the assumption that the *form* of the two ways which they used may not have been precisely the same. It is because scholars have tried to reconstruct from Barnabas and the *Didache* a *common* written source that disagreement on this question has been so great. Once it is seen that a common catechetical pattern, although not necessarily the same written document, lies behind these writings then most of the difficulties disappear. We venture to think that this will also throw light on the vexed question of the genesis of the Latin text entitled *De Doctrina Apostolorum*, of which a Greek original probably once existed. The *Doctrina* contains much of the material contained in the two ways section of Barnabas and the

Didache—in fact the *Didache* has about 90% of its material and Barnabas about 60% although the arrangement of the latter writer varies considerably from the *Doctrina*. It has been argued by E. J. Goodspeed (*Anglican Theol. Review*, xxvii (1945)) that the lost Greek version of this text was the original *written* "two ways" which Barnabas and the Didache had before them when they were composing their works; yet there are eight substantial items not present in the *Doctrina* which occur in our two writers, and this appears to be a strong argument against Goodspeed's theory. Nevertheless the *Doctrina* shows primitive features which suggest that it is not simply a later Latin translation of *Did.* 1-6. Our suggestion is that the *Doctrina* represents one early *written* version of the "two ways" pattern of teaching out of the many which circulated in the early Church. It was similar to but not necessarily verbally identical with the versions used by Barnabas and the *Didache*.

The metaphor of the two ways has a long history behind it in both Jewish and non-Jewish thought. Among the Greeks it was derived from the antitheses of Heraclitus, which in the fifth century B.C. were designed to arouse people from conventional ethics; it also appears in Xenophon, Hesiod, Theognis, Virgil, and Plutarch, and among the Pythagoreans it was symbolized by the diverging arms of the sacred letter Y (upsilon).[2] In Judaism the idea of the two ways—the one the way of righteousness and the other the way of evil—is found throughout the Old Testament and later Jewish writings (e.g. Ps. 1. 6; Jer. 21. 8; Prov. 4. 18-19; 4 Macc. 14. 5; 1 Enoch 94. 1-4; 2 Enoch 30. 15; *Pirké Aboth* 2. 1, *inter alia*). This twofold way was apparently emphasized in the instruction given to Gentiles, although its fullest development occurred in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs which date from the second century B.C. Thus Testament of Levi 19. 1: "Choose for yourselves either the light or the darkness; either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar"; Testament of Judah 20. 1: "Two spirits wait upon man, the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit"; Testament of Asher 1. 3; "Two ways hath God given to the sons of men, and two inclinations, and two kinds of action and two modes and two issues. Therefore all things are by twos, one over against the other. For there are two ways of good and evil; and with these are the two inclinations in our breasts discriminating them".

It is here that we should like to call in evidence the Dead Sea Scrolls. Prior to their discovery no actual Jewish *manual* incorporat-

ing the teaching of the two ways had been discovered, although, as we have seen, the idea was present in Jewish thought. It was, therefore, always open to scholars to argue that the writer of the epistle of Barnabas was the first to compose a manual of ethical teaching on this theme for his Christian readers, drawing out the *verba Christi* of Matt. 7. 13-14. However, embedded in the Manual of Discipline, the book containing the principles and constitution of the sect discovered at Qumran by the Dead Sea in 1947, was found a section concerning the two spirits in man. The manual itself is a compilation in which several formulations of the rules of this community were gathered together and with the Zadokite Work it has not been inaptly compared with the *Didache*, the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, and the Apostolic Constitutions—important documents for the understanding of the organization of the primitive Christian Church. This strict Jewish pietistic community who considered themselves to be the Elect of God and the true Israel provide an interesting glimpse of the beliefs of sectarian Judaism in the last two centuries B.C., although its influence should not be exaggerated. The section on the two spirits (Col. 3. 13—4. 26) has this introduction:

> This is for the man who would bring others to the inner vision [Hebrew *maskil*], so that he may understand and teach to all the children of light the real nature of men, touching the different varieties of their temperaments with the distinguishing traits thereof, touching their actions throughout their generations, and touching the reason why they are now visited with afflictions and now enjoy periods of well-being.

The word *maskil* means one who imparts to others his own inner vision—in other words a teacher (Cf. Dan. 11. 33; 12. 3, 10)—and it therefore seems probable that Professor Gaster is right in seeing in this section of the Manual an expository discourse designed to accompany the reading of the *torah* to the assembled members of the Qumran community, perhaps based on Deut. 30. 15: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." We know that expositions were a regular and independent feature of the synagogue service, and it became customary to invite any scribe who happened to be present to deliver the sermons (thus Matt. 4. 23; Luke 4. 15; *Lev. rabba* 3; *Pesikta rabbathi*, ch. 15, 78b, *Teruma* 1, ed. Buber, 2. p. 89); it was usual to close the exposition with the brief prayer: "May his great name be blessed forever and

ever and ever." It seems likely that in the larger towns these expositions of the *torah* were sometimes given on days other than the sabbath; from the period before the destruction of the Temple a tradition has been preserved concerning a body of men who assembled daily in the synagogue for reading and exposition of the Creation story (*Taanith* 4. 2; *Tos. Taanith* 4. 219[18]; *Bab. Taanith* 27b), and *Tos. Taanith* 2. 217[11] states that from early times the congregation assembled in the synagogue on the second and fifth days of the week for reading from the *torah*. It is therefore possible that the Qumran community when they separated themselves from Jewish urban life at an undisclosed date before the Christian era took with them into the wilderness this custom of the synagogue. It is difficult to say if the "two ways" method of exposition which formed a model sermon for the priests of the sect was itself already in use in the synagogue before the migration of the community; in view of the prominence of the metaphor in the Old Testament this is perhaps not improbable—in fact it was very suitable for the instruction of proselytes. In any case the Qumran priests appear to have worked over the traditional material, incorporating their own special theological ideas into it. In time the expository sermon on the "two ways" which circulated in written form may have become part of the instruction which was given to the children of the community. We know that these children had to undergo a ten-year period of study in the provisions and institutions of the Covenant, and that they had to study especially a manual known as the Book of *Hagu*, which was also to be the staple diet of the priests and lay judges of the community (*Zad. Work* 13. 1, 10. 7). The word *hagu* in late Hebrew means meditation or study, and this manual of study would no doubt contain ethical instruction on the way of life required of members of the community.

We must now consider in more detail the section of the Manual of Discipline on the two spirits in man. Following the introduction comes a section on the nature of the God of Knowledge parallel to the introduction to the mandates of the Shepherd of Hermas. Then the instruction proceeds: "Now, this God created man to rule the world, and appointed for him two spirits after whose direction he was to walk until the final Inquisition. They are the spirits of truth and of perversity." This idea of the two spirits created by God and guiding men was especially congenial to the Qumran community—although it also appears, as we have seen, in the Testaments of the

Twelve Patriarchs—and is almost certainly due to Iranian influence on Judaism. The eastern Iranian teaching of Zoroaster (c. 600 B.C.) preserved in the ancient poems known as the *Gathas* contains these sections:

> At the beginning, the two Spirits which are known . . . as twins
> Are the one better, and the other evil
> In thought, words, deeds; and between these two,
> The wise choose well, but not so the foolish. (*Yasna* 30. 3.)
> Of these two Spirits, the evil one chooses to do the worse things,
> But the most Holy Spirit, clothed with the firmest skies, sided with righteousness
> And thus did all those who are pleased to gratify the Wise Lord by honourable actions . . . (*Yasna* 30. 5.)

For Zoroaster there is but one God, the Wise Lord (*Ahura Mazda*) and below Him are the two spirits—the good spirit (*Spenta Mainyu*) and the evil spirit (*Anra Mainyu*) representing the realms of light and darkness which struggle with their angels against each other in the world drama as two armies. Undoubtedly this is the source of the Qumran doctrine although it is hazardous to suggest exactly how this Iranian idea entered Jewish sectarian teaching. Later from it developed the Rabbinic idea of the *yezer ha-tob* (good inclination) and the *yezer ha-ra'* (evil inclination) in every man which also appears to have been known to St Paul. The Qumran sermon continues:

> The origin of truth lies in the Fountain of Light, and that of perversity in the Wellspring of Darkness. All who practise righteousness are under the domination of the Prince of Lights, and walk in ways of light; whereas all who practise perversity are under the domination of the Angel of Darkness and walk in ways of darkness.

A remarkable parallel to this occurs at the beginning of the "two ways" section in the Epistle of Barnabas: "There are two ways of instruction—as there are two powers—that of Light and that of Darkness. And there is a great difference between the two ways: the one is controlled by God's light-bringing angels, the other by the angels of Satan. And as the latter is the Ruler of the present era of lawlessness, so the former is Lord from eternity to eternity" (Barnabas 18. 1-2)[3]; the *Didache* version is however much briefer: "Two ways there are, one of Life and one of Death, and there is a great difference between the two ways." (*Did.* 1. 1.) After an elaboration of the Light-Darkness theme, which was also central in

Iranian religion, the Qumran manual details the virtues of those who are guided by the spirit of truth and the vices which are the lot of those guided by the spirit of perversity.

> This is the way those spirits operate in the world for the enlightenment of man's heart, the making straight before him all the ways of righteousness and truth, the implanting in his heart fear of the judgements of God. A spirit of humility, patience, abundant compassion, perpetual goodness, insight, discrimination, a sense of the Divine Power that is based at once on an apprehension of God's works and a reliance on his plenteous mercy, a spirit of knowledge informing every plan of action, a zeal for righteous government, a hallowed mind in a controlled nature, abounding love for all who follow the truth, a self-respecting purity which abhors all the taint of filth, a modesty of behaviour coupled with a general prudence and ability to hide within oneself the secrets of what one knows—these are the things that come to men in this world through communion with the spirit of truth. And the guerdon of all that walk in its ways is health and abundant well-being, with long life and fruition of seed along with eternal blessings and everlasting joy in the life everlasting, and a crown of glory and a robe of honour amid light perpetual. But to the spirit of perversity belong greed, omission in right doing, wickedness and falsehood, pride and presumption, deception and guile, cruelty and abundant insolence, shortness of temper and profusion of folly, arrogant passion, abominable acts in a spirit of lewdness, filthy ways in the thralldom of unchastity, a blasphemous tongue, blindness of eyes, dullness of ears, stiffness of neck and hardness of heart, to the end that a man walks entirely in the ways of darkness and of evil cunning. The guerdon of all who walk in such ways is a multitude of afflictions at the hands of all the angels of destruction, everlasting perdition through the angry wrath of an avenging God, eternal horror and perpetual reproach, the disgrace of final annihilation in the Fire, darkness throughout the vicissitudes of life in every generation, doleful sorrow, bitter misfortune and dark ruin—ending in extinction without remnant or survival.

Such lists of virtues and vices were not peculiar to the Qumran teachers but were a commonplace of the ethical instruction in the Graeco-Roman world; the Pythagoreans and Orphics in particular were addicted to this kind of code and we know that a popular gambling game was played with counters each of which had inscribed on it the name of a different vice. The Dramatists and Stoics likewise made frequent use of this method although it was left to the Hellenistic Jew Philo to surpass all previous lists by

compiling one containing 147 adjectives descriptive of the man addicted to pleasure rather than to the virtue which was Philo's ideal. Catalogues of virtues and vices were also a commonplace of Old Testament teaching and in the New Testament occur in the teaching of Jesus (Mark 7. 21-22) and of St Paul (Gal. 5. 19-23; 1 Cor. 6. 9-10; Rom. 1. 29-32 *inter alia*). Their appearance in the Qumran Manual of Discipline was thus no innovation of the Qumran priests but probably was part of the stock-in-trade of Jewish teachers. Rendell-Harris long ago made the interesting suggestion that the Jewish list of vices was derived from the catalogue of sins recited at confession on the Day of Atonement.[4] Be that as it may it seems certain that the teaching of the Synagogue would contain instruction about the virtues expected of and the sins to be avoided by the good Jew and proselyte to Judaism, and we need look no further than this for the background of the Qumran lists.

After a section on God's truth and the calling of the community to share in his eternal glory the Qumran sermon concludes:

> Thus far, the spirits of truth and perversity have been struggling in the heart of man. Men have walked both in wisdom and in folly. If a man casts his portion with truth, he does righteously and hates perversity; if he casts it with perversity, he does wickedly and abominates truth. For God has apportioned them in equal measure until the final age, until "He makes all things new". He foreknows the effect of their works in every epoch of the world, and he has made men heirs to them that they might know good and evil. But (when the time) of Inquisition (comes), he will determine the fate of every living being in accordance with which of the (two spirits he has chosen to follow).

On comparison with the later Christian versions of the "two ways" in Barnabas and the *Didache* several interesting points emerge. The Qumran sermon breathes a devotional spirit which is absent from the later versions, and this is in line with the devotional note of the Thanksgiving Psalms of the sect. Here was a community of pious individuals who took very seriously the importance of an inward faith; but by the time of the epistle of Barnabas and the *Didache* in the late first and early second centuries of our era a tendency had appeared in Christianity which emphasized obedience to law rather than the possession of an inward faith in Christ, and because of this the ethical codes embedded in these writings are more

externalized in nature.[5] The Qumran priest merely desired to teach the members of the community "the real nature of men, touching the different varieties of their temperaments with the distinguishing traits thereof, touching their actions throughout their generations, and touching the reason why they are now visited with afflictions and now enjoy periods of well-being". In the "two ways" section in Barnabas, and especially in the *Didache*, there is a step away from this conception of religious inwardness; if we possessed other Jewish pre-Christian versions of the "two ways" it is possible that they too would reflect an interest in codification for its own sake. A further point of difference between the Qumran and the later versions is the treatment of the social code. In the Manual of Discipline this does not form part of the "two ways" section but is separate (Col. 5. 1-7) and is naturally concerned with rules considered suitable for the life of the sect. In Barnabas and the *Didache* however the slave—master theme—familiar from the social codes underlying the New Testament epistles—appears within the two ways section. The command to slaves to obey their masters in reverence and fear is probably pre-Christian but was given special emphasis in Christianity as an opportunity for the *imitatio Christi*. Such social relationships did not apply in the case of the Qumran community although its members are exhorted to obey the decision of their priests, the sons of Zadok, who have the deciding word in all doctrinal, economic, and judicial matters.

In certain respects the version of the two ways in Barnabas is closer to the Qumran sermon than that of the *Didache*. This is shown by the occurrence of the light—darkness realms[6] which are under the control of God's angels of light and the angels of Satan, and also by the emphasis on knowledge in both codes[7]; the *Didache* however does not have these themes. It might be argued that the author of Barnabas drew directly upon the Qumran "two ways" teaching for these ideas. We know that there were contacts between Alexandria and the Dead Sea area at the time of the rise of Christianity; Egyptian trading contacts in this period were very wide, and certainly bitumen for embalming reached Egypt from the Dead Sea region. Moreover archeologists are of the opinion that the large jars found in the Qumran caves in which the scrolls were stored are of Egyptian design, which suggests that a fairly close contact existed between the sect and Egypt. Likewise the Pythagorean element found in the teachings of the sect might be

due to contacts with Alexandrian thought. Furthermore the Epistle of Barnabas and the Qumran documents both reflect an attitude hostile to the Jerusalem Temple and *cultus* although both develop their arguments from different angles. And it is perhaps not beyond the bounds of credulity that some remnants of the Qumran sect may have joined up with Jewish and Jewish-Christian survivors of the catastrophic Jewish struggle against Rome which culminated in the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70, and so found their way to Alexandria along the route well-known to Jewish travellers. However, not too much should be read into these various possibilities. We have to allow for a complex Jewish-Iranian background behind the beliefs of Barnabas and the Qumran scribes, and no direct borrowing on the part of the Christian writer need be envisaged. It is not without significance that early Christian writers show no *direct* knowledge of the Qumran community or for that matter of the Essenes.

If we may now recapitulate, our view of the genesis of the "two ways" would read something like this. Within late Judaism instruction was given by the Rabbis and varied in its nature according to the audience addressed. Sometimes it took the form of expository discourses based on passages of the *torah* delivered in the synagogue service; at other times it formed, together with circumcision and baptism, the conditions for the acceptance of a proselyte to Judaism. It is likely that part of this instruction took the form of teaching on the two ways of life and death and light and darkness. This teaching circulated among the Rabbis in the pre-Christian era in both oral and written forms, and one example of the latter is found in an expository sermon contained in the Qumran Manual of Discipline, which the sect may have taken over from the use of the synagogue, although the Qumran scribes had worked this over and incorporated certain theological ideas of their own which they wished to emphasize in the teaching given to the members of the community. The exact form of this "two ways" teaching probably varied from place to place and from teacher to teacher—sometimes it may have contained a code dealing with social relationships. Christianity, which was otherwise heavily indebted to Judaism, as it developed its mission in the Graeco-Roman world took over from the *diaspora* Jewish forms of ethical instruction. Among these were the "two ways" teaching, which may have been known to the early Church in both oral and written forms. One

such written form was the original version of the *Doctrina Apostolorum* which is now only known in a Latin version. The fact that a *verbum Christi* was in existence concerning the two ways of life and the fact that Christianity itself came to be known as the Way (Acts 18. 26) gave added impetus to the use of this form of instruction in the Church's approach to the ordinary man.[8] Eventually the Syrian writer of the *Didache* made use of a "two ways" instruction which had been originally used in the teaching of Jewish proselytes (cf. *Did.* vi. 2), although he added to it excerpts from the Sermon on the Mount and generally made his own arrangement of the material. Likewise the Alexandrian author of Barnabas in the time of Hadrian incorporated a similar Jewish instruction (perhaps through the medium of the Hellenistic synagogue?) into his epistle which bore marked resemblances to that used by the writer of the *Didache* in some matters although differing in others. The form used by Barnabas was closer to the version of the Manual of Discipline than that of the *Didache*. However, between the original Jewish oral pattern of teaching and the written forms in the Christian documents may lie a number of oral and written versions not verbally identical yet which all contained fundamentally Jewish ideas. The contention of the Rabbinical scholar C. Taylor as long ago as 1888 that Jewish models existed behind the later Christian "two ways" code is thus correct.

1 *The Vision of God* (1931) 111-124.

2 Note also the *Tabula* of Cebes (16) a disciple of Socrates; "Dost thou not see a little door and a way in front of the door, which is not much crowded, but the travellers are few? That is the way that leadeth to the true instruction."

3 Cf. *Hermas Mandates* 6. II. 1-2. "Hear now", said he, "concerning faith. There are two angels with man, one of righteousness and one of wickedness. How then, Sir, said I shall I know their workings, because both angels dwell with me?" This version is probably independent of Barnabas and may represent one crystallization of the "two ways" form of teaching, ultimately going back to Iranian ideas, which circulated in the early Church.

4 *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (1888).

[5] Later Christian instruction struck a higher ethical note. Cf. the fragment discovered by P. M. Barnard in the Escurial Library which is certainly the catechetical instruction given by Clement of Alexandria to the newly baptized. The opening words exhibit the gentleness of touch which is the mark of a great Christian mind—"Cultivate quietness in word, quietness in deed, likewise in speech and gait, and avoid impetuous eagerness. For then the mind will remain steady and will not be agitated by your eagerness and so become weak and of narrow discernment and see darkly".

[6] The metaphor of light and darkness which is ultimately due to Iranian influence is prominent in the New Testament and was associated quite early with baptismal instruction. Later it passed into patristic thought—a good example occurs in Clement of Alexandria's Exhortation to the Greeks II. "Upon us who lay buried in darkness and shut up in the shadow of death a light shone forth from heaven, purer than the sun and sweeter than the life of earth. That light is life eternal, and whatsoever things partake of it, live." The metaphor is also prominent in the Enneads of Plotinus, which show traces of Iranian dualism.

[7] The concept of truth which is prominent in the Scrolls is not, however, found in Barnabas. In the Scrolls it is often the equivalent of the *torah* (=Samaritan *qushtâ*).

[8] The Epistle to Diognetus shows the different approach which was made to the pagan *intellegentsia*.

THE MORAL EMPHASIS IN GORE'S THEOLOGY [1]

THE BISHOP OF EXETER

IN ORDER to demonstrate the moral emphasis in Gore's theology I have not thought it necessary to read through the whole of Gore's published works. Nor have I gone through those which might be thought to bear most directly on my subject—namely the books concerning such subjects as Christian sociology. For the point which I wish to make is the moral emphasis so prominent in Gore's specifically theological writings. It is in his essays in dogmatic theology that this moral emphasis comes so strikingly to the fore—to a degree, I believe, which is rarely to be found in the writings of any other theologian. It is almost as though Gore kept continually before his mind as a perpetual reminder and warning the text, "Faith without works is dead". For him doctrine is subordinate to morals. What a man believes is, of course, of the very greatest importance. But its importance consists precisely in the influence which it has upon his conduct.

I propose, in the first instance, to illustrate this by citations from two of Gore's books: one written towards the beginning of his life, and the other towards the end. I ought, perhaps, to apologize for the extensiveness of the citations from Gore's works with which this lecture will be found to be filled. But I suspect that Gore is now suffering the fate common to most men, namely that he is little read by the generation immediately succeeding him. Much, therefore, of that which I shall read will, I suspect, be new to many of this audience. But in any case I think that my point can best be made by allowing Gore to speak for himself.

Listen then to this passage from *The Reconstruction of Belief*, Book 3 (in the one volume edition, 1926, page 775):

[1] The Bishop Gore Memorial Lecture given by Dr Mortimer in Westminster Abbey, November 1957.

This self-revelation of God was essentially dogmatic; that is to say, it was presented not by way of argument or as a conclusion of reasoning, but as the word of God, not to be gainsaid.

And the next point that we notice about it is that it was primarily moral—a challenge to the conscience of men and a strict requirement that they should conform their life, social and individual, to its demands.

Then, after a passage about ecclesiastical authority, he continues (page 777):

But let us advance from the Old Covenant to the New. The Inaugurator of the New Covenant speaks with more than prophetic authority. Sometimes indeed he argued; and we shall come back upon our Lord's use of argument. But in the main certainly He did not argue. He affirmed as one who had a right to affirm infallibly. Sometimes, as we shall see, He gave men glimpses into divine mysteries which became the basis of Church doctrines. But there can be no question that in the main His teaching was moral. He presented a way of life to men's hearts and wills. The critical matter in His eyes is the opening of their hearts to the light and the surrender of their wills to obey. The constant assumption is that "he that willeth to do God's will, shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God".

Thus when the Church of the New Covenant went out into the world, the first name of it was "The Way". Its primary function was to exhibit among men a new way of life—a new kind of fellowship with God realized in a new kind of fellowship of men. People talk disparagingly of a "merely ethical gospel," and contrast it with the Gospel of the New Testament. Quite rightly. The new law for the Church was warmed and inspired by a gospel about God and redemption—about Father and Son and Spirit—which made it something very different from a mere code of ethics. But nevertheless it was primarily as a way of life to be lived by a community, claiming to be both the true Israel and the New Humanity, that the religion of Christ went out into the world and converted men. The bulk of the New Testament is ethical teaching. It describes and enforces "The Way". Even in the most doctrinal epistles this will be found to be surprisingly true.

With this we may compare a passage in one of his earliest works, The Bampton Lectures of 1891. Here, on page 212, we find:

What I am complaining of, what I want you to complain of, with a persistence and a conviction which shall make our complaint fruitful of reform, is—not that commercial and social selfishness

exists in the world, or even that it appears to dominate in society: but that its profound antagonism to the spirit of Christ is not recognised, that there is not amongst us anything that can be called an adequate conception of what Christian morality means. The prophetic function of the church, as it seems to me, at the present moment, is not so much, in the first instance, to expand Christian influence as to concentrate it: to see to it that all men, whatsoever be their own convictions and practices, shall at least acknowledge what it is that a Christian must believe, and how it is that a Christian must live and act at all the points where he touches human life.

There must be produced a clear acknowledgement of what it is that a Christian must believe. We must strive to purge from all accretions the current presentation of the Christian creed, and to rid it of all that can bring it into conflict with the legitimate claims of reason, or seem to limit the freedom of enquiry or of criticism. We must so preach our creed, as to "commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God". But when we have done our best to effect this, the Christian creed will stand out, as in past history and in Scripture, so in the preaching of to-day, as a distinctive intellectual position, in regard to which a man may be in one of many different attitudes, but the general meaning of which he can hardly fail to apprehend. In the same way we must have all men acknowledge how it is that a Christian must live. We want the Christian moral law, the law of purity, of brotherhood, of sacrifice, to be as intelligibly presented and as clearly understood, as the dogmas of the Christian creed. We want it worked out with adequate knowledge in its bearing on the various departments of human life. In a word, we want a fresh and luminous presentation of the Christian moral code and some adequate guarantee that one who is deliberately, persistently, and in overt act, repudiating its plainest obligations shall cease to belong to the Christian body. "Do not ye", writes St Paul to the Corinthian Church, "judge them that are within, whereas them that are without God judgeth? Put away the wicked man from among yourselves".

Or again, in the popular work which he wrote in 1929 for the Home University Library called *Jesus of Nazareth*, we find on page 249:

> Christianity went out into the world as a life to be lived, and that the life of a closely organic community, rather than as a theory or a theological creed to be believed. It ought always to present itself to the world primarily as the good life to be lived in human brother-

hood. It is lamentable that doctrinal conflicts, about Christ and about the sacraments and about the organisation of the Church, have caused it to present to the modern world quite a different aspect.

This concern that the doctrine and practice of the Church should display to the outside world a dramatic picture of a community of brothers, a living relationship, a pattern and example of true and fruitful human organizations, constantly recurs in Gore's writings. For example, in the Bampton Lectures, page 211, he writes:

> There exists what can rightly be called a Christian socialism, by the very fact that the law of brotherhood is the law of Christ. It is quite beyond all question that according to the intention of Christ, the Christian Church should at all times represent a body living not only by a certain rule of faith, but also by a certain moral law, which puts the sternest restraints on the spirit of competition, on the acquisition of wealth, on selfish aggrandizement; which bids every man, in the simplest sense, love his neighbour as himself, which enjoins the bearing one another's burdens, as the only fulfilling of the law of Christ.

Then again in the *Reconstruction of Belief*, page 454:

> The aim of the Church is to show here and now the true human fellowship realized in Christ. It is bound to make war, in the name of Christ, on all injustice as much as on all impurity. It must take all human life for its province. It must develop its philosophy, its art, its principles of social economy. It exists in the world, but not of the world, and that means that it must vigorously and combatively maintain the true principles of human brotherhood and human life against "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life"—that is, against the social aims and practices of the selfish, avaricious, and lustful world. This seems to me indisputable.

Or again in the *Reconstruction of Belief*, page 647:

> There is nothing, I think, more central to the mind of Christ than the principle that you can only love God in fellowship—that you can only love God by and in loving your neighbour. And then, when you ask "Who is my neighbour?" it appears that your neighbour is every man; and that the function of the Church is to give a home to all men indiscriminately, if only they want to live the good life; and to let men see in the Church what brotherhood means, there where the motives of men are sufficiently purged to make real brotherhood possible. Unfaithful to this principle as Catholic Christianity has sometimes shown itself to be, this is its root principle. . . . It is because the mass of men are, as they stand, beyond the appeal of

brotherhood, that the method of God is to gather those who respond to the appeal of the Gospel into an organized society which shall show, embodied in fact, what human brotherhood really means. I do not believe that till we have fully appreciated this law or fact we shall ever have a chance of understanding what Catholicism at its root means; and Church History really deserves the name only by exhibiting the principle of brotherhood in actual practice. "Ecclesiastical" ought to mean "brotherly". It did really mean this in the days when it cost men much to call themselves Christians.

And, lastly, in the *Reconstruction of Belief*, page 967:

I see no prospect of reunion among Christian denominations on any wide scale within the measurable future. . . . But whatever the future holds, there is, it seems to me, one thing which can be seriously undertaken at once, the importance of which it is hard to exaggerate, that is, the union of Christians in their various sections for moral and social witness and service.

It is in this that our traditional Christianity has been so lamentably and increasingly partial and onesided. Christianity is, first of all, "The Way". It is a life—a social life to be lived. It is as a life, rather than a doctrine, that in the New Testament it makes its tremendous and difficult claim upon men. The doctrine is only the necessary background of the life. There can be no question that our Lord intended His Church to make its appeal to the world mainly by the life which men saw it living. In this way His disciples were to be the salt of the earth, the light of the world, the city set on a hill. And when the Church recovered herself from her first moral peril, due to the vast invasion from the Gentile world, she maintained her moral standard, her standard alike of self-control and brotherhood, through the long days when Christianity remained a dangerous venture. It was in the main as "The Way" that she conquered.

"Established Christianity", whether in the civilized Roman Empire or in half-barbarous tribes or in modern nations—the sort of Christianity which claims to embrace the whole society, which it costs men nothing to profess, and into which children are baptized practically as a matter of course—appears to be as audacious a departure from the method of Christ as can well be conceived. Whether it was a venture made under the guidance of providence, or the greatest of all the mistakes or corporate sins of the Church, it is not for us to decide. In imagination we ponder inevitably over the question of what the history of the Church and the world would have been if, in the days of Constantine, the Church, while gratefully accepting from the Emperors full toleration, had obstinately refused to accept the Imperial power as an instrument for propagating and

maintaining religion, had jealously maintained its independence and its former standards of moral discipline, preferring reality of profession to numbers; and if later it had altogether refused to baptize the Franks in platoons in the suite of their chief, as if they were only just changing their old hero gods for a better and stronger one. We can dream of the difference it would have made in the history of the world and the Church, but we can only dream. The facts were otherwise. What price was paid for the assistance of the strong arm of emperors and kings we know. Christianity began to cost men nothing to profess; or rather, it very soon cost them their life to profess anything else. The difference in the average moral level of church membership was immediately apparent. We see it already in the sermons of Chrysostom in the East, and Augustine in the West. The average moral level had become what it is to-day.

Of the moral witness of the Church in our own country we know the record: it is in many respects an honourable record; but in many respects it has been startingly deficient. It has been content, flatly contrary to the spirit of our Lord, to draw a marked distinction between respectable and disreputable sins—stigmatizing drunkenness and violence and fornication, while it has practically condoned avarice and the love of money, and contempt of social inferiors, and selfish luxury, and injustice—as to which "respectable" sins we know the mind of our Master. Politically it has been strangely content to be merely nationalist and patriotic."

He goes on to say on page 970:

I do not want to weary my readers by saying constantly the same things. But I write under a profound sense that the first duty of the Church to-day, in all lands, and particularly in our own, is to re-erect the ethical standard of Christianity not only with regard to sexual relations and the control of our passions, but also with regard to commercial morality and the obligation of truth both in commerce and politics, to the right and (much more) the duty of property and the sin of avarice, and to the meaning of brotherhood and the equal spiritual value of all human souls. . . . What we have to remind ourselves of, is that the Christ who is to judge the world—both the living and the dead—is the same Jesus of Nazareth who spoke the Sermon on the Mount and the parables of judgement and mercy, and that He does not change His character with the changes in the Church's disposition.

I know that such a fundamental ethical reform in the Church's teaching would be very unpopular in many directions. It would encounter many prejudices. It would alarm many vested interests. What sort of restoration of moral discipline it might lead the way

to, I do not know. But I feel certain of one thing—that it, and it alone, would attract and win a great body of men and women such as would have been among the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth; that it would cut right across all our denominational divisions; that it might unite all the most real friends of Christ in co-operative effort even at once, while the long process is gone through of thinking out afresh our theological principles; and that it, and it alone, will make the world understand what the Catholic Church is for.

It will have been noticed that in the passages which I have so extensively quoted three themes constantly recur. The first is that the Christian religion and Church suffered a major disaster by the mass conversion which followed the age of Constantine. What Gore calls "the diffusion of Christianity" has almost irretrievably blurred and distorted the picture which the Church displays to the world, and consequently weakened its impact. From his early days Gore was convinced of this, and warned against the consequent dangers. Witness in the Bampton Lectures, page 208:

Now if, with this intention of the founder of our religion in our minds, we look back over the history of Christianity, we cannot but perceive that nothing has been really more fatal to its influence, than the false methods of diffusion to which the Christian Church has so frequently abandoned itself. I refer, in the first place, to such wholesale conversions of races as that to which Frankish Christianity owed its origin: conversions such as led to a Christianity in which catholic orthodoxy and ritual practices were combined with a morality which, at least in certain aspects, was frankly pagan. I refer, secondly, to the tendency which has exhibited itself nowhere perhaps more conspicuously than within the area of the special influence of the Jesuits, but from which those who have been most opposed to that great society have been by no means free—the tendency to transfer the strain of Christian obligation from the life to be lived, to the creed to be believed: to make dogmatic orthodoxy or submission to ecclesiastical authority the "one thing needful", and granted that, to rest content with the very least degree of moral effort, as if submission to the Church could compensate for it. Now there is no doubt that if we take mankind generally within our view, we must recognise that intellectual submission and ritual conformity are very much more easily obtained than moral effort. But in the New Testament, if Christianity appears as a religion making a definite demand upon the intellect, as well as a definite claim upon the life, the latter is unmistakably the more severe and the more prominent. It is assumed throughout that he that "willeth to do

God's will", he who makes up his mind to moral self-committal, shall "know of the doctrine": it is assumed that the difficulty of being a Christian is practically over, when the will is right, and the courage of self-commital won. In the Bible the antithesis to faith is not reason but sight—that is, the vision limited by the world, the worldly and selfish temper. Now by contrast to this I do not think it is possible to contemplate the Christian Church of the middle ages or of modern times, without seeing what great need there has frequently been to redress the balance. The theological and moral claims have shown a tendency to change places, and, in consequence, a very imperfect representation has been given of the claim of Jesus, or of the claim of Christianity before it became the nominal religion of the world, upon the lives and consciences of men.

There is one more false principle of diffusion which I must notice: it is that identification of the church with the nation which was the outcome of the Reformation as it took place in England, and which in its best form is represented in the ecclesiastical theory of Hooker. I say, it is found in Hooker in its best form, but still in a form which we can now perceive, in the light of experience, to have been profoundly dangerous. For, however noble is the idea of a "Christian nation", the church has no right to commit itself to the state, on the assumption that the state has committed itself to the church. The assumption is unwarranted, and the identification of church and state which is grounded upon it, results in an almost inevitable confusion between the province of spiritual authority and spiritual obligation. What the state sanctions, is assumed to be the sufficient rule for the Christian: and what the state sanctions must in the long run, as is increasingly manifest, represent the judgement of the majority, or the wishes of "the average man". Thus it has come about that it is difficult—to one at all familiar with the language of the New Testament incredibly difficult—to persuade English people that there is a law, and a social law, binding upon Christians, which is not the least abrogated because the law of the state, representing the will of the majority, may have come to ignore it; that in order to live as Christians they have to look beyond what is generally expedient, or what appears to be practicable in state policy, up to the law which came forth from the lips of Jesus Christ. . . .

The second theme is the distinction between "reputable and disreputable sins". That is to say the apparent sensitiveness of the Christian conscience on certain matters and its, to Gore, shocking insensitiveness in other, and perhaps more important, respects. This theme also finds expression in the Bampton Lectures in Gore's paraphrase of the parable of the Last Judgement, page 213:

Many will come to Him at the last day—so we cannot but paraphrase His own words—with manifold pleas and excuses derived from the maxims of what is called the Christian world: "Lord, we never denied the Christian creed: nay, we had a zeal for orthodoxy, for churchmanship, for Bible distribution, but of course in our business we did as every one else did: we sold in the dearest and bought in the cheapest market: we did not, of course we did not, entertain any other consideration, when we were investing our money, except whether the investments were safe: we never imagined that we could love our neighbours as ourselves in the competition of business, or that we could carry into commercial transactions the sort of strict righteousness that we knew to be obligatory in private life. Lord, in all these matters we went by commonly accepted standards: we never thought much about Christianity as a brotherhood." Then will He protest unto them, "Did not I say to thee and to thee, in that written word wherein thou didst profess to have eternal life: "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth"? Did I not warn thee, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God"? Did I not bid thee seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness? Did I not tell thee that except a man, in spirit or will at least, forsook all that he had, unless he took up his cross and followed Me, he could not be My disciple? Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth, that hath done, the will of My Father".

Or again in *Jesus of Nazareth,* page 69:

In every settled society there tends to grow up a distinction between respectable and disreputable sinning. Certain kinds of sins are "scandalous". They tend to upset the decent order of society; they "outrage morality", by which is meant the accepted standard of orderly and decent living. Such sins are murder and violence and theft, and blasphemous or atheistical language, and adultery or open sensuality which desecrate the home life. Other sins, though they may be formally regarded as sins, are tacitly condoned or taken for granted. Now, no one can read any one of the Gospels without perceiving that Jesus absolutely refused to recognise any such distinction between respectable and disreputable sins. Nothing is more evident than that in his eyes the love of money, selfishness, contempt of others, pride, uncharitableness, are at least as bad as violence or adultery or fornication. Nay, he regarded the sins which are scandalous in the eyes of society as in this sense less spiritually dangerous than the respectable sins, that the latter are harder to repent of and to forsake. "The publicans and the harlots", he said to

> the highly respectable Pharisee, "go into the Kingdom of God before you". . . . No doubt some writers, not only in our own age, have misused the fact that Jesus was specially alive to the danger of "respectable" sins, as if it meant that he was lenient or comparatively indifferent to those which are commonly "disreputable"—in particular that he condoned or lightly regarded sexual sin. But this is not the case. . . . But when he did talk about sensual sin, it was with a simple severity. One of the few occasions when he gave a plain answer to a plain question and spoke with dogmatic authority was in asserting the indissolubility of the marriage tie.

The moral disaster of the diffusion of Christianity led to the toleration within Christian society of what may be called the fashionable sins. Gore's revulsion from these two developments in the history of Christianity led him to the third theme which so constantly recurs in his writings and which I may perhaps call a moral aristocratic exclusiveness, that is, a tendency to wish to see membership of the Church limited to those who are totally committed to Christian moral teaching in all its implications. I can. perhaps, best describe this tendency by some further quotations:

In *Can we then Believe?*, published in 1926, a volume of essays replying to criticisms of his *Reconstruction of Belief*, in a note on page 188, Gore says:

> I think the explanation of these extreme claims for renunciation, as of the similar injunctions of non-resistance to injury or violence, lies in the deliberate determination of our Lord to commit His message to the world to those only who were prepared to go all lengths with Him. As He Himself not only refused any compromise with worldliness, but also lived as a mendicant, free from all natural ties, so He demands of His disciples the same extreme detachment. Nothing could secure His message being really delivered to the world except the most stringent method for sifting out from among men the absolutely uncompromising spirits, such as would shrink from no sacrifice, such as would come into the kingdom bare and naked. Our Lord could not entertain, or ceased to entertain, any hope of a general reform in Israel. He saw that what was needed was a fresh start from a rigidly purified nucleus. This accounts for the way in which He concentrated Himself more and more on the disciples, on the Twelve, and did not shrink from deterring the crowds. . . . But when the message was widely delivered—as we see it in the Epistles of the New Testament—it had not quite the same emphasis on literal renunciation as we find in the teaching of Jesus—neither in James, nor Peter, nor Paul, nor John. The ethical teaching

of the Epistles is indeed true to the type of Christ's, but, as I say, it has not the same emphasis. The principle indeed that one must die to live—die to the old world if one is to live to the new—is indeed always there; and the exhibition of this principle in actual renunciation of wealth or family life receives some strong encouragements; but on the whole it is not contemplated as normal. All the writers of the Epistles write as to a religious community which is to live the common family life and the life of good citizenship, as well as of good membership of the brotherhood—which is to build the Kingdom of God in this world. . . . In the fullest sense the Church was needed to interpret Christ to the world. And the place which literal renunciation of the elements of normal social life is to hold in Christianity can be judged only when we see what sort of fruit grew out of the drastic purging method by which Christ provided the pure seed.

The purging process to keep the Church from worldliness is always needed, and needed over and over again. It was at first supplied by persecution, and the social "boycotting" of Christians. For some centuries it cost men much to profess the Christian name. At once, when Christianity was recognized as the religion of the Empire, and it began to cost nothing to be a Christian, the average moral level went down to where we see it as reflected in the sermons of Augustine and Chrysostom. But while Chrysostom was preaching, hundreds of thousands of Christians were exemplifying the principle or renunciation in the most literal sense by going out of the great cities into the desert, and the same movement was alive in the West, ready to be more profitably organized in the monasticism of Benedict. I believe it to be true that the normal life of Christians, as married people or good citizens, requires for its maintenance, on any really Christian level the concurrent witness of actual renunciation—"the Religious Life"—side by side with it.

Or consider again the Bampton Lectures, page 206, where Gore describes Mohammed's appeal to the average man:

The standard of Mohammedanism, by contrast to Christianity, may be described as a standard deliberately adapted to the average moral level of the men to whom it was meant to appeal.

It is this spirit of moral accommodation which has made Mohammedanism at once so successful among its votaries, in securing conformity to its rules and also so destitute of really progressive power. The method of Christ is in striking opposition. He, before Mohammed, said "The flesh is weak"; but from the starting-point of this acknowledgement He proceeds by a quite different path. No book exhibits so profound a contempt for majorities, so startling a refusal

> to consider the conditions of success on the average, as the New Testament. Jesus Christ makes His appeal to the best: upon the selected disciples He spends His efforts: for them He prays: them He trains in His own school as the nucleus of a redeemed humanity, to act upon the world as "salt", as "light", or as a "city set upon a hill"—that is, as a body acts, the savour or appearance of which is distinct, emphatic, unmistakable. So the Christian Church in the world is to be a body coherent, based upon distinctive principles. exhibiting a striking and emphatic ideal. It is to be in the world and not of it: making its impression by its very distinctiveness: "that men might by the good works which they should behold, glorify God", if not in days of worldliness and prosperity, yet at least "in the day of visitation".

It is, however, interesting to observe that with this morally aristocratic exclusiveness, this recognition that the true moral teaching and standards of our Lord are only exemplified in the lives of the saints and heroes, there goes a deep dislike of any suggestion that there should be a "double standard" of morality within the Christian community, one for the Saints and one for the common man. No. There should be one and that a very high standard for all Christians and in consequence those who do not come up to that standard, or do not try to come up to it, should be rigorously excluded. This explains his insistent desire to see a more effective discipline exercised by the Church upon her members. On this last point it is worth while to quote a note to the Bampton Lectures on excommunication, note 57, page 271:

> It is inseparable from the idea of a Church's healthy action that she should be exercising "the power of the keys", the power of including and excluding, by formal and free discipline, doctrinal and moral. That this power needs to be exercised with consideration and liberality is of course true: it is also true that due checks upon its exercise need to be provided, because like every other power it may be misused. But its liability to misuse is no excuse for a churchman acquiescing in its practical disuse.

And again, *Reconstruction of Belief*, page 779:

> Theological controversy, fascinating and absorbing the Greek intellect, tended to give the Church the appearance of a great society primarily claiming assent to theological propositions, precisely formulated and balanced. Also the new position of the Church as the religion of the Empire brought with it an enormous peril. Henceforth

> it cost men nothing to profess the Christian name. Nay, after a short interval it cost them very much to profess anything else. Hence the average standard of living in the Church declined with astonishing rapidity. The "standard of the Saints" survived in religious houses and elsewhere. But the average moral level of Church membership became deplorably low—"secular and grovelling", as Frederick Denison Maurice called it. And the Church for long ages has acquiesced in this double standard: an ideal for saints and a requirement for men of the world of all classes—a minimum of conformity necessary for salvation. But it is hardly possible to imagine anything more contrary to the moral claim of our Lord than this kind of compromise on the largest scale with the spirit of the world.

I end with three reflections, or rather questions. The present revision of the canon law, which is an attempt, among other things, to reintroduce some element of discipline within the Church—as for example in such matters as divorce and indiscriminate baptism —would surely have commanded Gore's sympathy and support. And yet would we not also have heard him thundering his prophetic warnings and denunciations against the immoderate expenditure of ecclesiastical time and energy upon such internal reformations whilst the international world lies under the shadow of thermo-nuclear destruction and national society is divided by the bitter quarrels of a class war based on fear, envy, and malice?

Secondly, it is well known that Gore was deeply interested in Christian sociology and convinced of the gross injustice inherent in the structure of society in the period in which he lived. It is equally clear that Gore was not a socialist in the political sense of that word. Indeed he had warning words to say on the Welfare State: "With the groups of proposals which come under the head of State socialism I am not here at all concerned. I may, however, confess myself to be among those who would somewhat jealously set limits to the paternal supervision of the democratic state." It seems to me that at this time we badly need his voice to lift the political economical controversies of our day on to a higher plane by setting before us once more, with a challenging passion, the will of God for a just ordering of society from which distrust and envy shall be banished and tolerance and mutual charity shall prevail.

Thirdly, it is well known that Gore laid great stress, not only on the Church as a divinely ordered human society, but also upon the Sacraments as means of expressing and creating that order of living

In this connection I may, perhaps, be allowed to weary you with one further quotation, *The Body of Christ*, page 323:

> Baptism puts at our disposal new spiritual power for our personal life, but it does this because it incorporates us into a new society. And the new "member", thus incorporated, proceeds either at once, or, in the case of an infant, as his powers mature, to receive his full citizenship in the New Jerusalem by his "sealing" in confirmation. This laying on of hands again conveys an individual endowment—it is the strengthening of the individual life by the gift of the Holy Ghost. But it is also a social ceremony with a social meaning. It is outwardly a benediction from the chief officer of the society, and it conveys to the confirmed his full right in the royal and priestly body. From very early days it was accompanied by anointing: it was at least called an "unction" from St. John's days. This meant, what the early mediaeval ritualists expressly stated, that the member on whom hands were laid was being consecrated king and priest—consecrated, that is, to his full civic and religious rights. This primitive idea makes thoroughly reasonable the novel ceremony of our present Anglican rite, which associates with confirmation the formal acceptance by the now responsible individual of the moral duties of his Christian position. But we have lamentably let slip the accompanying idea of the lay priesthood and citizenship, an idea so essential to that reform of the Church on really representative lines which is so widely desired, and for which confirmation ought to afford so significant a basis.

The social aspect of Holy Communion was particularly dear to Gore. Much of his teaching is now embodied in the growing popularity of the "Parish Communion", yet those who frequently attend the Parish Communion and value it highly, cannot sometimes but wonder whether, among the numbers which now throng the altars, something of that deep personal devotion to our Lord which was the secret of Gore's own religion and the main-spring of that of the Tractarian reformers whom he followed, has somehow been not a little smothered.

My three questions are these. 1. Would Gore now think that the revision of the Canons is not worth the effort and advise us to abandon it? Or would he, on the contrary, even at a risk of schism and of disestablishment, press for a code of "rigorist" Canons because of his morally aristocratic temperament?

2. Would Gore now denounce the weaknesses of the Welfare State with the same passion and emphasis with which he denounced

the injustices of the old capitalist society? Would he, that is, inveigh against the impaired sense of responsibility and a lack of that "sturdy independence" on which our forebears prided themselves, and against an ever increasing dependence upon material comfort and even luxury, and against the monopolistic power with all its capacity for exploitation and abuse now vested in the great Trusts and Employers' Federations on the one hand, and the great Trade Unions on the other?

3. Since Gore's death there has been a growing acceptance of the doctrine of the Church as a visible organization and of her Sacraments as corporate activities with social implications. This is in accordance with his own teaching. Would he, now, be found warning us against the danger of submerging personal religion and individual piety in a life of only corporate worship? Would he, perhaps, find himself in more than a little sympathy with the "Neo-Evangelicals" whom we call the Fundamentalists, precisely because of their stress on personal piety—prayer and bible reading—and on a personal trust in Christ as Saviour, and because of their clear, coherent, and rigid moral standard?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Incarnation of the Son of God (the Bampton Lectures for 1891), John Murray, 1891.

The Body of Christ, John Murray, 1901.

The Reconstruction of Belief (single-volume ed.), John Murray, 1926.

Can we then Believe?, John Murray, 1926.

Jesus of Nazareth, Home University Library, 1929.

LEAVES FROM A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PARSON

GORDON HUELIN

AMONG the clergy licensed by Gilbert Sheldon, Bishop of London (1660-3), was John Wade, though, since Hammersmith, of which he had charge, was then but a Chapel-of-ease to Fulham, no entry relative to his appointment is to be found in Bishop Sheldon's register.[1]

In itself such an event would not be of great significance, for there were many similar appointments. But whereas most of those other clergy licensed are now simply names and nothing more, Wade stands out from the rest by reason of a remarkable document which, only comparatively recently, was brought to light after lying for many years in the safe of Hammersmith Parish Church. Doubtless various people during the course of the last two centuries have picked up the document, and then, with an expression of disgust, have put it down again as being utterly incomprehensible. It was through the painstaking efforts of the late Mr Albert Foyer, M.B.E., that its pages have at last been rendered intelligible.[2] He showed that the strange hieroglyphics which Wade used were really his adoption of a system of shorthand, invented in the seventeenth century by Thomas Shelton, and known as "Tachygraphy".[3] These leaves reveal not only an intensely human person, but also afford insight into the life and conditions of a parish and parsonage in the second half of the seventeenth century.

John Wade took up his appointment in December 1662; he was then thirty years of age. Accepting Mr Foyer's divisions as appear in his transcription of the original document, the first section comprises Wade's own private diary, which does not begin until June 1666, and comes to an end in February 1669. It is unfortunate that the space of time covered is so brief. Moreover, while these pages repay careful study, it cannot be said that they make exactly happy reading.

In the first place, Wade did not see eye to eye with the new Bishop of London, Humphrey Henchman, who succeeded Gilbert

Sheldon in 1663. From Wade's own account it might appear that he was in disgrace on account of his over-conscientiousness, since he made it a habit of constantly preaching against the profanation of the Lord's Day, and gave two sermons a Sunday instead of the usual one—a practice of which the Bishop strongly disapproved. But there was more to it than that. The Bishop, succeeding to the important diocese of London, shortly after the Commonwealth interregnum, and the Savoy Conference wherein he himself had taken part,[4] had heard at first-hand the arguments of the Presbyterians and was undoubtedly troubled by some clergy who, even after the Act of Uniformity of 1662, still hankered after Presbyterianism within the Anglican Church. It does seem too, that Wade, at least in his early years at Hammersmith, was given towards Presbyterianism. That many of the books he chose for his own reading and as presents for his friends were written by Nonconformist divines, coupled with the fact that he allowed men to attend public worship with their hats on, and his habit of using extempore prayers, gave support to Bishop Henchman's assertion that he was "not hearty to the liturgy and government established".

As if to bear this out still further, Wade at this time displayed a strong partiality towards the celebrated Richard Baxter, who had recently settled at the nearby village of Acton. There, on 20 October 1668 Wade paid him a visit, perhaps with the hope of securing a living with his help, and possibly even the living of Kidderminster, from which Baxter had been ejected on the fateful St Bartholomew's Day 1662. We have in these pages of Wade, a hitherto unpublished glimpse of Baxter himself:

> I went to Acton to see Master Baxter and I fear though Master Baxter had formerly a good opinion of me yet now he hath but slight thoughts of me. For I believe he looks upon me as a censorious person for, as if God had a design to lay me low in his thoughts, I did not carry myself with that waryness of expression which I should have done, but said of Master Gouge, the Bishop's chaplain, that he was of a very good nature. He said he hoped he had more than nature in him. I said I hoped so too but he was somewhat loose in his principles. And considering Holdcroft and Corbin I spoke of their gathering a church out of servants and weak people that through want of judgment required unreasonable things of them, and were so poor they were not able to maintain them who could not keep themselves. Master Baxter said though they were servants they

might be good and that those Ministers did not want food and raiment. And seemed to take ill such expressions. . . . And he said he could not rule the people of Kidderminster now though formerly he could have done it. For though he never would write to them since he left them, yet he spake with some of the chief of them and advised them to communicate with an honest minister they lately had, but he could not bring them to it. They would hear in publick but not receive the sacrament there. And though Bishop Morly[5] said if they turned out the Ministers they should easily rule the people, yet the people fly further off from them than Ministers themselves do. . . .

Wade was forced to acknowledge what a Christian spirit Baxter showed in making the best of everything. "How contrary is my spirit", he writes, "to his charitable holy spirit." He at least returned from that visit to Acton a humbler man. Yet as far as bringing him a new sphere of work, it was without profit, for he was to remain at Hammersmith for nearly forty years more—until his death in 1707.

A special difficulty arose out of the nature of Wade's position. As has already been mentioned, in those days Hammersmith was a Chapel-of-ease under the Vicar of Fulham. Thereto, in April 1666, Bishop Henchman instituted Richard Stevenson,[6] and it was to him that Wade had to give his allegiance, as well as the fees he received. The position cannot have been an easy one, and it is not altogether surprising to discover instances of friction and rivalry between the two men. Wade, for his part, did not manifest any great loyalty towards his vicar, and eagerly listened to scandal concerning him. On the other hand, Stevenson, says Wade, resented the fact that "when the gentry gave him a shilling they gave me forty".

Another source of trouble was Wade's own conscience. He was a conscientious man, perhaps indeed, at times, a little over-scrupulous, as when he wrote: "When you gave the sacrament, in the consecrating of the elements ye did not do it so exactly nor carry it so smoothly as ye should have done." Nor does he hesitate to tell in these pages of his diary, of his own struggles against temptations of one sort or another, as well as of his frequent falls. Did the fact that many people bestowed upon himself and his family personal gifts, lead him to become avaricious? At any rate, an item under the date 19 August 1688 reads:

> Break off the ill custom ye hath gotten of telling some what great gifts others give you.

Sometimes, he felt that he had given way to self-indulgence, either by being too frivolous with the ladies, joining in their game of "Hot Cockles",[7] and playing the fool and kissing them; or by taking too much wine and tobacco, and eating sturgeon too freely at supper. And there was that day when he wrote:

> I was guilty of the most devilish, hellish passion that ever I was guilty of in my life and that after sacrament day. . . . The good Lord deeply humble me. Make me penitent. Pardon me. Change me or I am undone for ever.

The object of this outburst of wrath which so troubled Wade was none other than his wife, who appears here and there in these pages, and perhaps never better than on the occasion when we see her, as the typically faithful parson's wife of every age, encouraging her husband in good works:

> When you have been at prayer with any of your parish never grudge or think much at it if you find your body a little spent or tired. Say "So long as my body is not wasted in a way of sin I am cheerful and contented; so long as I spend myself in the work of God and service of souls I am not troubled at all at it but satisfied in it."

John Wade's greatest thorn in the flesh—he once in fact, describes him as such—was his reader "Master Ellis", whose name occurs in this first section of the document more than that of anyone else. We may certainly sympathize with Wade here. Ellis was a schoolmaster to whom for a while the parson sent his own children. In these pages he is seen as a young and ungrateful upstart, filled with pride and self-conceit, who liked to hear his own voice in the pulpit, and was so incensed when he was not allowed to preach that he went off to the neighbouring parish of Chiswick. He was disloyal to Wade and constantly failed to carry out his duties. Once, at a poor woman's funeral, he was so drunk that he nearly fell into the grave. Ultimately, Wade was compelled to get rid of him.

The second section of the document, as Mr Foyer has transcribed it, consists of Wade's private expense account, covering the period from Michaelmas 1671 until Lady Day 1674.

As would be expected, a good deal of this deals with the ordinary items of housekeeping and clothing, which, with a wife and six children—five sons and one daughter—to look after, would have

been a considerable drain upon Wade's resources. Various amounts were spent on the children's education and school-books. Once, probably in a fit of despair, Wade paid 2s. to someone "for searching after the value of a living". There was also that occasion when he had to admit that he had lost 5s. 6d. at cards—"which was more than I had lost in twenty-five years before". Now and then charitable donations figure in these pages, as, "Given a Minister's widow 6d."; "Given to the brief for Sugar Bakers 10/0". Odd sums go towards drinks and tips for workmen and others and, of course, the inevitable Christmas-boxes.

The items of particular interest however, can be classified under two headings: (*a*) Books, and (*b*) Gardening.

(*a*) The various books mentioned are noteworthy as illustrating the kind of literature which was being read by an ordinary parson and some of his people during the later years of the seventeenth century. Bearing in mind Wade's affection for Richard Baxter, it is only to be expected that at least one of the works of that divine should find a place in the expense accounts.[8] In fact, Wade purchased two copies of Baxter's *A Call to the Unconverted to Turn and Live*, and gave one of them to "Mistress Smith's gardener".

Two other writers for whom Wade seems to have had a liking were Joseph Alleine and his father-in-law, Richard Alleine. Evidently he had discussed the latter with Baxter when he saw him at Acton for, in his account of the visit, Wade writes:

> He [Baxter] said he had no acquaintance with Master Alleine but liked his works well. And saith his style is mended and more affectionate in every book. And commended to me and all preaching ministers his last book about *Victory over the World* as a book very worthy of imitation for popular preaching. He said it was most useful and would do most good.

Like Baxter, both the Alleines had the misfortune to be ejected from their posts in 1662 for Nonconformity, and Joseph spent some time in gaol.[9] Joseph Alleine's works were particularly popular. Wade here records that he paid 2s. for "Master Alleine's *Alarm to the unconverted Sinner* given to Mistress Pye", whilst he also gave a copy to his wife.

To his tutor Wade presented a book with the curious title of *The Holy Ghost on the Bench, other Spirits at the Bar*, written by an unbending Presbyterian, who had died a few years previously, Richard Hollingworth. The name of John Howe, another of Baxter's

friends and fellow-sufferers for Nonconformity, is also found in these pages. Wade commends to a friend Howe's book *The Blessednesse of the Righteous*, price 3s., with the remark:

> I do not know that ever I met with a book of that bigness that hath more real worth in it. I do not question but it will richly entertain and highly satisfy both the man and christian in you.

All this would support what has already been said, that at this period Wade had definite leanings towards Presbyterianism. Yet, in spite of that, in common with many other Presbyterians he had little sympathy with the Baptists, and it may have been with some eagerness that he purchased for the sum of 1s., Edward Fowler's *Dirt wipt off: or A manifest Discovery of the Gross Ignorance, Erroneous and most Unchristian and Wicked Spirit of one John Bunyan*—a scarcely dignified reply on the part of the Bishop of Gloucester to the Bedford evangelist.

The fact that in his own works, *Redemption of Time*[10] and *A Practical Discourse of Confession of Sins to God*,[11] published some years later, Wade is no longer quoting Presbyterian writers, but instead referring to such unquestionably Anglican divines as George Herbert, Henry Hammond, and Jeremy Taylor, suggests perhaps a change in his theological opinions with the passing of the years. A difference of viewpoint with a development in his sacramental theology most certainly seems to lie behind the question he asks in the former of these works:

> Will you pretend to value a Sermon, and yet unworthily slight the Sacrament? Seem to make Conscience of hearing two Sermons usually every Lord's Day; and yet let your receiving the holy Communion twice or thrice a Year at most, suffice your Souls and satisfy your Consciences?[12]

In addition to the various theological volumes mentioned in this second section of the transcript, Wade purchased three recently published books on horticulture written by William Hughes: *The Complete Vineyard*, *The Flower Garden*, and *The American Physician*. A perusal of the last-named work reveals that there is added to it "A discourse of the Cacao-Nut-Tree and the use of its fruit, with all the ways of making Chocolate". Wade himself included amongst the notes in his diary a recipe "How to make Chocolet", but this does not agree in detail with any of the several recipes given in Hughes' volume.

Reference to these horticultural books leads on naturally to: (*b*) the second item of particular interest, namely Gardening. Bowack's *Antiquities of Middlesex*, published in 1706, includes Wade's parsonage among the "very handsome seats" of the neighbourhood.[13] Such houses would inevitably include large gardens. The cost of the upkeep of the parsonage garden in a country parish then, as now, must have formed a heavy charge upon a clergyman's income. Wade obviously enjoyed his garden: perhaps, like certain other writers, he gained inspiration as he sat in his summer-house, paved with tiles.

Eight times in these leaves do we find lists of amounts spent on the garden. From the end of November 1672 until 21 March 1673, less than four months, the expenditure upon the garden was £3. 19s. 10d., a fair sum in those days. A new interest in gardening in England had come into being with the Restoration, and Wade seems to have gone in for the practice on a considerable scale, so that, after he had been a few years at Hammersmith, he could have boasted a small orchard consisting of apple, peach, "apricock", cherry, and plum trees, nectarines, strawberry plants, raspberry canes, gooseberry and currant bushes, and vines; a vegetable garden of beans, lettuces, spinach, parsley, onions, and horse-radishes; a herbal garden with thyme, purslane, hyssop, sage, marjoram, sorrel, clove, chervil, pennyroyal, and southernwood; and a flower garden which included roses, violets, auriculas, tulips, a "double rocket", gillyflowers, jonquils, carnations, "blew" anemones, hepaticae, stocks, polyantheas, oxlips, red and yellow primroses, rosemary, and hollyhocks.

Added to the cost of buying all the trees, vegetables, and plants were the usual items, such as weeding, mowing, and dunging; and one entry, which is a reminder of the pests against which all gardeners have to contend:

> To the mole catcher for coming several times, catching one mole and stopping up the passage with tarr to keep the moles from coming behind the summer house out of Hodgkin's garden into ours 1s.

Comparatively few records of private gardens, with the sums of money spent upon their upkeep survive from as early as the seventeenth century. John Wade's account, therefore, is in this respect of real importance and value.[14]

The final section of Mr Foyer's transcript is the longest, but it consists entirely of graces, thanksgivings, and prayers, most of which, as far as can be determined, would seem to be of Wade's own composition. References to Baxter and to Howe suggest that some may have been derived from the literature he read, and a good many are based upon, and include quotations from, the Psalms, Proverbs, and other books of the Bible.

Whilst, obviously, some were for his own private and personal devotions, others may very well have been used by him during public worship; indeed, we have it on Wade's own admission, that one of the things which displeased Bishop Henchman was that, at any rate during his early days at Hammersmith, he did not use a set form of prayer before his sermon, but chose whatever he pleased. Possibly the Bishop had heard of his "Prayer before sermon to startle the profane persons of our Chapel"!

As in the pages of the diary, Wade's deep sense of personal sin once again becomes apparent, since by far the greatest number of prayers fall under the heading of "Confession of sins". Historic events find a reference in these devotions, as for example, in the "Thanksgiving for the King's Restoration" (1660), or the " Prayer for success of the treaty with the Dutch" (1667), and the "Prayer to mind us of the uncertainty of all outward injoyments. Occasioned by the burning of the City"—a reference to the Great Fire of London of the year 1666. There are a couple of prayers for the people of Hammersmith. This section ends with a reflection upon the eternal damnation of sinners, a topic cherished by theological writers in Wade's day, to some of whose works, such as those of Bishops Pearson and Reynolds, he here alludes.

Two prayers "Against the Papists" are the sole reference in all these pages to a religious body which must have been intensely obnoxious to a man of John Wade's Protestant outlook, and with whom he was singularly afflicted in his country parish of Hammersmith—for long known as "Pope's Corner". We should like to have had Wade's comments upon the visit of the notorious Titus Oates to the village, in his fanatical search after Romish recusants in January 1680. That and much else, if ever it existed, is now unhappily left to our imagination.

There is, however, among the London diocesan archives stored in the muniment rooms of St Paul's Cathedral, a paper in Wade's own handwriting, with the signature that appears in his diary. It is a

return of "The Names of Papists dwelling in Hammersmith", made in obedience to a letter sent out to all his clergy by Bishop Compton of London. It is dated 1706, the year before Wade's death, is neatly written, and gives a careful and exact answer such as one would expect from so methodical a person as John Wade.[15]

One may see in that scrap of paper, as in the leaves which Mr Foyer transcribed, the work of a parish priest who, in spite of his faults, was throughout his life conscientious and sincere—as when he wrote this prayer:

> Help me to do the work of my ministry faithfully, successfully, comfortably. Succeed and prosper all my studies, labours and endeavours. Convert and strengthen me and make me a means of converting and strengthening others. Turn me and let me turn many unto righteousness.

1 Corporation of London, Guildhall Library MS. 9531/16.

2 I am indebted to the present Vicar and Churchwardens of Hammersmith Parish Church for lending me the original copy of the late Mr Albert Foyer's transcript, for the purpose of writing this article. Also to the Reverend M. R. McCann, M.A., Assistant Master, Latymer Upper School, for first introducing me to John Wade's diary.

3 Wade refers in his accounts to having purchased a copy of "Shelton's shorthand book".

4 Cf. "Humphrey Henchman D.D., Bishop of Salisbury, 1660-1663", by Canon J. M. J. Fletcher, F.R.Hist.S., in *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, Vol. XLVIII, 1938, pp. 301-312.

5 George Morley (1597-1684), became Bishop of Worcester in 1661, and after refusing to allow Richard Baxter to officiate at Kidderminster, visited the town himself, and preached against Presbyterianism. Baxter was probably referring here to *The Bishop of Worcester's Letter to a Friend for Vindication of himself from Mr Baxter's Calumny*, London, 1662, ". . . for my part I know no better way for undeceiving and reducing of the People, then by removing such Ministers, and then we shall see when the blowing of those boisterous winds ceaseth, whether the waves will not be still or no".

6 Guildhall Library MS. 9531/16 f.117.

7 Mr Foyer did some research into the origin and meaning of this obscure game. A description of it is contained in J. Strutt, *The Sports and Pastimes of the People of England*, London 1801, p. 308, with a pictorial illustration facing p. 310.

8 R. Baxter's *The Saints' Everlasting Rest* is recommended in the diary as a book from which to read a daily portion.

9 See C. Stanford, *Joseph Alleine: his Companions and Times*, London 1861.

10 *Redemption of Time, the Duty and Wisdom of Christians in Evil Days. Or, a Practical Discourse, shewing what special opportunities ought to be redeem'd. What mispences of Time are to be avoided. With convincing Reasons, quickning Motives, and proper Directions for the right Improvement of precious Time.* Recommended as profitable for Families, and proper to be given at Funerals. By John Wade, Minister of Hammersmith. London 1692.

11 *A Practical Discourse of Confession of Sins to God, as a means of pardon and cleansing.* By John Wade, Minister of Hammersmith. London 1697.

12 *Redemption of Time*: Epistle Dedicatory "To the Gentlemen and Inhabitants of Hammersmith".

13 John Bowack, *The Antiquities of Middlesex*, London 1706, Pt. II, p. 43.

14 Mr P. Strangeman, Librarian of the Royal Horticultural Society, showed interest in this section of the article, and helped by directing me to works of reference on the subject.

15 See "Some Early Eighteenth-Century Roman Catholic Recusants" by Gordon Huelin, in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. VII, No. 1. April 1956, pp. 65-6.

THE CHURCH AND NUCLEAR WARFARE

WARREN SANDELL

WHAT ought Christians to think about nuclear warfare, about the making of such weapons as the hydrogen bomb, and about their use in war? To some the answer seems obvious and simple, but it is not. The whole matter is complex, requiring orderly, clear thinking for its analysis.

Five questions may be asked about the H.B.[1] Current discussion often confuses them, but they should be clearly distinguished and treated separately. Obviously the urgency of such an inquiry arises from the indisputable fact that to use the H.B. in war would be knowingly to cause the indiscriminate slaughter on a vast scale of men, women, and children, besides inflicting on an even vaster scale the extremities of terror and hideous physical injuries unknown in human warfare till Hiroshima. Moreover, it is certain that, given time enough, scientific knowledge will so develop that within a fairly short period the virtually complete destruction of all mankind will be a practical possibility.

It is in the light of these facts that the following questions should be asked and, if possible, be answered by Christian people according to Christian principles of right and wrong:

1. Would it be lawful for the State to use the H.B. in a just war?

2. Would it be lawful to use the H.B., in any war, if the enemy used it first?

3. Is it lawful for the State to promote and finance the construction of the H.B., and for individuals to design and make it, *now*, in time of peace?

4. Is it lawful *now* for the State to promote, and individuals to pursue, the invention and construction of progressively more powerful weapons of mass destruction?

5. Is it lawful *now* to test the efficiency of these weapons when made?

The question "Is it lawful?" is two-fold: Is it lawful for the State to do these things?, and Is it lawful for Christians voluntarily to co-operate with the State in doing them?

Besides their ethical import, these five questions can have a practical and political significance, which may be brought out by substituting "politically or militarily expedient" for the one word "lawful". It is with these aspects of the matter that politicians are chiefly concerned, and the wisdom or otherwise of their opinions should be assessed accordingly. The Christian will be inclined to say at once that political and military expediency, even if estimated accurately, cannot justify actions which are inherently immoral. Apart from the unproved assumption indicated by the last two words, the questions of expediency and what is morally right are by no means entirely separate and distinct from each other, and still less are they contradictory. This was recently made clear by the opinion expressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. He approved of the Western Powers making the H.B. now because he believed that its possession by them is the most effective deterrent to any potential enemy using it first. On the generally well-founded assumption that the Western Powers would not use it first, their possession of it is therefore an effective guarantee that nobody will begin a major war, and that the H.B. will not be used at all.

If this widely held estimate of the situation be accurate, it follows that the Western Powers are justified in keeping abreast of, and even surpassing, any potential enemy in producing increasingly effective weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, if this be the most practically effective means of keeping the peace and preserving mankind from unimaginable horrors and possible annihilation, then the matter passes out of the sphere of mere expediency into the realm of moral obligation. It would justify answering "Yes" to Questions 3 and 4. And it would not be "doing evil that good may come", for the H.B. can be evil (if at all) only in its use. If its existence in the circumstances described *prevents* its use, then its existence is good and not evil.

Experience during the post-war years seems to confirm the opinion that, so far, the possession and development of these weapons by the Western Powers has been at least a potent factor in deterring Russia from beginning or provoking a major war. And it is certain that in considering the question of war the Russian rulers

would be influenced by political and military expediency rather than by considerations of humanity and ethics.

There is, however, no proof that at any time within the twelve years which have passed since the frightful slaughter and havoc wrought by the Germans in Russia came to an end, its rulers have contemplated beginning another war even of the "conventional" kind. In judging that the H.B. in the hands of the Western Powers has been and is the determining factor in maintaining peace, two assumptions are made which in fact are at least not quite certainly true, namely: (1) That Russia has or would have seriously considered beginning a major war during the past 12 years; and (2) That it was the H.B. of the West and not something else (e.g. the need for internal reconstruction) that deterred her, if she did consider it. In view of the immense superiority of Russia in mobilized and potential man-power and "conventional" weapons, it is certainly highly probable that the H.B. was the determining factor in keeping the peace. But if this be true of the past, for how long will it be true of the future, especially in view of the Russian claims made in September, and repeated by Mr Kruschev on 17 February.[2] Nobody can do more than guess the answer, bearing in mind the following considerations:

1. That Russia may devise a weapon, as she now claims to have done, capable of far more widespread destruction than anything which at the same time we possess.

2. That this weapon quickly used on the compact target presented by Britain would destroy so many people and places that any power to retaliate effectively, or at all, would also be destroyed.

3. That, even without a more effective missile, Russia might produce one in such a superior quantity that a massive projection of such missiles (e.g. by rockets) would equally paralyse retaliation.

4. That the U.S.A. might withhold active support from us in some dispute which Russia would regard as a *casus belli*, and so begin a "conventional" war with vastly superior land, submarine, and air forces. In the attempt to avert total defeat we might be forced to use the H.B.[3] If so, the compact target of Britain, as compared with the vast areas over which the Russian industries, people, and even army would be dispersed, would place us at immense disadvantage when the Russians immediately retaliated in kind.

5. It is not wholly improbable that the Western Powers will obtain (or retain) and keep a lead in nuclear weapons. If so, then Questions 3 and 4 may still be answered affirmatively.

6. Those who would call a halt to the production of the H.B. are usually influenced by the belief that an "armaments race" has been, and ultimately is bound to be, the cause of war. So far as wars in which we have partaken are concerned, this is not true. In both World Wars Germany was encouraged in belligerent courses by our real military weakness, and also by underestimating our actual strength and our will to make war. At least from the time of Henry VIII England has never been adequately prepared for any of her wars, and experience gives no guidance as to what might happen if, for the first time, England were adequately prepared for war.

On the whole it would seem that the affirmative answer to questions 3 and 4 has up to now been justified, but that it is impossible to predict for how long the argument based on expediency will remain valid.

At this point it may be well to attend to the following considerations:

1. That if Great Britain now ceased to make and develop nuclear weapons she would, humanly speaking, expose this country and its people without defence against conquest and occupation by a ruthless and barbaric power which would destroy our religion, freedom, and civilization.

2. That Christians have no right to count on the supernatural intervention of Divine Providence if they deliberately refuse the means of protection which their God-given reason tells them to be necessary. That is the sin of presumption.

3. That these means can justifiably be rejected only if they are intrinsically immoral.

4. That our defection would increase the perils to which the other free nations are, with us, exposed.

Question 5 is the easiest to answer. (1) If it be lawful to *make* the H.B. now, it is also lawful to test it, providing that neither death nor injury to health or property (except by accident) is thereby caused. (2) If it be not lawful to make it but nevertheless it *is* made, the practical necessity of testing it does not by itself constitute another unlawful act. It would be absurd to call the harmless

explosion of an H.B. immoral in itself. (3) In so far as the testing assists the perfecting of the weapon, then such tests are to be welcomed or deprecated according to whether the weapon in our hands is deemed to be a deterrent to war or a provocation. (4) The desirability of furnishing by these tests an advertisement of our achievements must be judged by the same considerations.

The words "Is it lawful?" are chosen because they are familiar to Christians as the opening words of the only question put to Christ which drew from him a plain political pronouncement, and that too on a highly controversial topic about which a public expression of opinion was not without its dangers.[4] Christ not only told his hearers to pay tribute to Caesar, but he seems to have been wholly unconcerned with a number of things which would certainly have exercised the mind of a modern churchman if placed in the same situation. Here are some of these things:

1. That the tribute was paid by the Chosen People of God, who alone preserved on earth the knowledge and worship of the only true God, to the Pontifex Maximus of the official, idolatrous polytheistic cult of an immemorial paganism.

2. That the Roman Emperor's *right* to rule and tax the Jews was based on nothing better than conquest and force.

3. The purposes for which the money might be used.

4. The methods of government and the personal characteristics of a pagan despot such as was the Emperor Tiberius.

5. That the payment of tribute could tend only to strengthen and perpetuate the dominion of the pagan Empire over the people of God.

The Pharisees, and indeed most of the Jews, regarded (1) as in itself amply sufficient to render any voluntary payment of tribute utterly unlawful and abhorrent. It would seem, however, that the attitude of the Apostolic Church was in close conformity with the mind of Christ, if we are to judge from St Paul's words: "The powers that be are ordained of God", and St Peter's admonition "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether to the King (*Basilei*) as supreme, or unto governors. . . ." And the *Basileus* they meant was Nero.[5] This attitude will be dealt with later. Here it is enough to say that it ought not to be ignored when considering the answers to Questions 1 and 2.

If it were possible to-day to put to our Lord this question: "Is it lawful for the State to use the H.B. in war, and for Christians to co-operate therewith?", few, if any, Christians could imagine him answering simply "Yes". That is, of course, because of the appalling destructive effects of nuclear warfare. At once there arises the question of the "lawfulness" of certain weapons and military tactics used in modern war. Have the developments in weapons and air tactics since 1939 been of such a kind as to make a "lawful" major war virtually impossible? If they have, then it is clearly wrong for Christians to take any part in such warfare. The belief that this is so arose during the first World War, and has in recent years become more widespread. It is not easy, however, to determine at what point warfare ceased to be lawful on the ground of extreme inhumanity. Increased efficiency in weapons is by no means always accompanied by increased inhumanity. The Lee-Enfield rifle of 1914, and modern machine guns and revolvers are, in themselves, probably the most humane weapons ever used in war. Yet in the War of 1914-18 the trench warfare, with its horrors of endurance in cold, and water and mud, together with the terrific artillery barrages, produced such a degree of suffering, mutilation, and death in the armies of both sides, that it seemed to many that war had passed beyond the stage of what it is lawful for a Christian to countenance. In the last war the sufferings of the troops were far less in extent and kind, and attention was drawn to the effects of air bombardment on civilians. After the Battle of Britain, German bombing was largely, but not wholly, indiscriminate, and sometimes the civilian population suffered more heavily because of our success in deflecting enemy planes from their objectives. Because it proved impossible at night successfully to pin-point particular German war-factories, the R.A.F. adopted area bombing, i.e. the bombing of large towns in which there were factories and installations important to the German war-effort. This inevitably caused high casualties among civilians, and it has been openly admitted that the secondary object of these tactics was to break down the people's morale. Not even the "heat tornados" at Hamburg succeeded in achieving this.

Article XXXVII, which declares "It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars", was framed in a *country* which had never experienced the devastation of a major war, by *people* who had little, if any,

imaginative conception of it, and in an *age* when modern notions of humane conduct were unheard of. But, if the sufferings inflicted by war on non-combatants are to be a test of the lawfulness of war for Christians, then it is impossible to disregard the large-scale continental wars from the Crusades onwards, nor those of more remote antiquity. War on a large scale has always been accompanied by atrocious barbarities and devastations inflicted intentionally or incidentally on the civilian population in the lands where it was waged.

Returning now to Christ's decision about paying tribute, and the teaching of the Apostolic Church recorded in the New Testament, it would seem not to be quite certain that Christ would to-day flatly condemn Christian participation in nuclear warfare merely *because of the extensive destruction of human life which it would cause.* Indeed, the very possibility of its being the means by which most of mankind and the fabric of this globe may be destroyed, may raise the whole thing into the realm of the eternal purposes of Divine Providence, which it would be futile and perhaps impious to try to frustrate. Is it wholly fanciful to think that the final cataclysm immediately preceding the *Parousia* might actually be brought about by the perverse ingenuity of man himself? If what has hitherto been attributed to the direct intervention of God can actually be effected by man's devices, can the latter be deemed more immoral than the former? Similar considerations may be applied to major natural catastrophes such as earthquakes and plagues, which have from time to time inflicted suffering and death on millions of so-called innocent people with at least the permission of the God who is Love. But have not these things their place in the inscrutable, eternal designs and purposes of God? If the inner structure of the earth, and unimaginable myriads of microbes and bacteria, can be the instruments of his Will, why not man, his highest creature, be his agent in the consummation of the age? Whatever the validity of these speculations, they seem to indicate that the possible climax of nuclear warfare does not necessarily enhance its wickedness, or confirm the opinion that Christ would to-day condemn it.

In any event, has the Church, i.e. the present representatives of the historic and once visibly *one* Catholic Church, any duty as such to issue a judgement on the lawfulness or otherwise of the State preparing for or even engaging in nuclear warfare? The union of

Church and State which developed after the Edict of Milan eventually brought about a situation unknown to the first three centuries of the Christian era. The State was deemed to be Christian and the Church asserted the right to judge the morality of its acts, and in the later Middle Ages was developed the juridicial concept of two *societates perfectae*, the Church concerned with men's eternal and spiritual welfare, and therefore superior, and the State concerned with men's temporal welfare. The concept of a *societas perfecta* necessarily included legislative, juridical, and coercive powers, and hence there grew up the vast fabric of medieval Canon Law, with judges and courts for its administration, officials to apprehend suspected offenders, and prisons in which to detain and punish them. For carrying out the gravest penalties, e.g. that of death for heresy, the Church usually relied on the "secular arm", i.e. the State, under the threat, if need be, of excommunication. In England a large part of this system survived the Reformation, and especially the basic ideas which were its foundation.

How far are these ideas ultimately the basis of such declarations as Archbishop William Temple publicly made in 1942, when he affirmed the *right and duty* of the Church "to declare its judgement on social facts and social movements, and to lay down principles which shall govern the order of society"?[6] Such a right and duty can logically be held to pertain only to a Church which at least claims infallibility in its judgements. The Church of England claims no such infallibility, nor do the great protestant nonconformist Churches. The Roman Church claims it, but has so far made no authoritative pronouncement on nuclear warfare, except to deprecate it in general terms. And the Church of England officially rejects the Roman claim to infallibility. If the establishment of the Churches of England and of Scotland be thought to involve them in some special obligation to judge the morality of the acts of the State, it is obvious that no such obligations can apply to the non-conformist Churches here, to the Anglican Church throughout the Commonwealth and Empire, nor to the great Christian Churches of the U.S.A., none of which have even a nominal union with the State.

Too little attention is paid to the fact that there can be no *moral* difference between killing 100,000 people with 2,000 aircraft using area bombing tactics, and killing the same number by one hydrogen bomb. Indeed, on the score of inhumanity, since in the former case

the attackers might easily suffer some 1,500 fatal casualties, and in the latter none at all, the latter seems to be preferable. At what point do the numbers of the slain and the nature of the weapons and tactics used, cause warfare to pass from what is "lawful" to what is "unlawful"? How can this be determined, especially in the light of history?

There is another point of view, coherent, rational, and by no means contemptible, and it is that of complete pacificism. It is rejected here but not discussed because its worthy discussion would require a special treatment at considerable length. It is, however, submitted as the only logical alternative to the conclusions which are here suggested. On this point the following quotation from Archbishop William Temple is pertinent:

> Though you cannot advance the Kingdom of Christ by fighting you can prevent Christian civilization, or a civilization on the way to becoming Christian from being destroyed, and that is what we are now engaged in. If you look at the New Testament carefully there can be no doubt there is a theology of the State as well as of the Church, and that it is our duty to do as citizens in support of the State things which it would be inappropriate to do as Churchmen in support of the Church and its cause. . . . The duty to fight is a civic duty which, if the cause be good, Christianity accepts and approves, but it is not a duty which has its origin in Christianity as such.[7]

The following answers to the five questions are merely suggested in the light of the considerations which have been here stated. The rejection of any or all ought to arise from repudiating with reasons the cogency of these considerations.

1. Yes. It is not required of the Church to express any official opinion.
2. Yes (*a fortiori*).
3. Lawful? Yes. Expedient? It depends on circumstances.
4. Lawful? Yes. Expedient? It depends on circumstances.
5. Lawful? Yes. Expedient? It depends on circumstances.

It is not to be disputed that war is a manifestation and consequence of the disorder and confusion brought into the world by sin. It originates in hatred not in love, and like all envyings, strifes, railings, angry contentions, and so forth, it is an expression of evil and not of good. But because the disorder in the world and in

man's nature has not deprived either of all good, we can and must distinguish good from evil, and lesser evils from greater, in each case preferring the former. In the absolute sense all war, whether waged with nuclear weapons or with swords and battle-axes, is evil. But within the actual sphere of reference, which is the world disordered by sin, we may discern degrees of evil, and judge of certain wars that in them the good outweighs the evil.

[1] Hydrogen bomb or any nuclear weapon or missile.

[2] *Daily Telegraph*, 7 March 1958, p. 17.

[3] Loc. cit., p. 18.

[4] Matt. 22. 15-22; Mark 12. 13-17; Luke 20. 19-26.

[5] Rom. 13. 1-7; 1 Pet. 3. 13-17; Titus 3. 1.

[6] *Life*, p. 578: Albert Hall speech, 26 September 1942.

[7] *Life*, p. 544: Letter to a pacifist during the last war.

AUXILIARY CLERGY AGAIN

G. F. S. GRAY

THAT old question of Auxiliary (or Voluntary, Part-time, or Non-stipendiary) clergy is to be discussed once more at the forthcoming Lambeth Conference, so it is perhaps worthwhile to take another look at the question. It is clear that if the pros and cons differ, as they do, according as to whether we think of town or country in England, they differ much more in different countries of West and East. And the question has to be considered against the background not only of the Church of England, which, if the mother of the Anglican Communion, is in some ways a rather peculiar old lady, but of the Anglican Communion in general. The present writer gleaned opinions and information from a number of correspondents and other sources overseas, and also discussed it with Anglican clergy from a number of countries in lecture-seminars at St Augustine's College, Canterbury. There is no space here for a comprehensive survey: the most that can be attempted is a rapid preliminary glance: if it is provocative, so much the better.

By Auxiliary Clergy, I mean the proposal that, in addition to whole-time clergy, such as we now have, including those whose time is mainly devoted to teaching, men should be ordained as priests who are engaged in, and would continue in, non-ecclesiastical (I prefer this to "secular") occupations, as doctors, lawyers, farmers, engineers, business men, and so on. Indian clergy sometimes describe as Auxiliary Clergy retired government servants, or perhaps men retired from other professions, who are ordained late in life, with less than the usual training, and give the whole of their active time to the Church, while receiving no salary and living on their pensions, But this is not quite what is meant by the proposal for Auxiliary Clergy in the strict sense, of which it is an essential element that two vocations should be combined and pursued simultaneously, and that the priesthood should be exercised in the world of industry or medicine or what ever it may be. Something more, also, is meant than the proposal to revive the permanent diaconate, though some of the underlying issues are the same: after

all, deacons can do virtually nothing which lay readers cannot, and celebration of the Eucharist is crucial. The question is also different from that of giving a greater place to, and making more use of, the laity: in fact, widespread use of Auxiliary might easily diminish the use of the laity, in so far as many of the most active laymen would be among those ordained, and it might be inferred that those not ordained could do little. The proposal for Auxiliary Clergy is also different from, though to a considerable extent it overlaps, the suggestion that men trained and ordained in the usual way should work in industry, commerce, and the like. It is pretty generally agreed that no question of theological principle is involved.

The proposal for Auxiliary Clergy is one that, with a few striking exceptions, is a live issue in most countries. The most obvious exception is the United States. A new canon was recently adopted there allowing for the ordination of permanent deacons (and a leading atomic scientist there is now such a permanent Anglican deacon), but there appears to be no desire for Auxiliary Clergy in our sense: the number of suitable men seeking ordination appears to be sufficient, finance is no difficulty, there are few small scattered groups of Anglican churchpeople. It would probably be claimed that there is no gulf between clergy and laity, such as in England constitutes in the opinion of some an argument for having Auxiliary Clergy. In a discussion on the matter, one American priest expressed the doubt whether an Auxiliary priest could be sufficiently independent of the secular culture to speak with a prophetic voice; another held that a man could be prophetic much better if engaged in non-ecclesiastical work, though this should be work not alone but with others, for example in a factory.

In Canada there seems to be much more of a case for Auxiliary Clergy. There are many small scattered groups of Anglicans, who cannot be properly shepherded: they tend to get lost, and drawn into local community churches. An Auxiliary priest might well be the answer in such a situation. On the other hand, it is denied that there is a gulf between clergy and laity which needs bridging. The opinion is expressed that such non-stipendiary clergy, if ordained, should never be in sole charge of a parish. It appears, incidentally, that in one Canadian diocese most of the clergy have (or recently had) for financial reasons to take non-ecclesiastical jobs.

Several of the clergy in Ghana are engaged in educational work, and an African Church leader sees much good in this: as well as

influencing their pupils to Christianity, they help them to realize that religion should permeate everyday life, and should not be kept in a separate compartment. The only disadvantage is that apart from taking services they are not able to give much time to strictly ecclesiastical work. But the attitude of both clergy and laity to clergy engaging in secular occupations, except education, is, it is said, most unfavourable. Ordaining men who would continue in farming, commerce, industry, and the like should not be countenanced except where the cleric in question is strictly attached to the Church and draws his stipend from the Church, as is done by the Roman Catholics in Ghana. Auxiliary or part-time ministers are regarded as third- or fourth-rate men where they are allowed, as by the sects. It is contended that the ministry is a special calling quite distinct from everything else, and involves the whole time talent and energy of those who are called to it. Some twenty-five years ago, when there was a dreadful shortage of clergy, the then Bishop of Accra mooted the idea of ordaining men who would continue in other occupations, but the scheme was so vehemently attacked, especially by the laity, that it was dropped at once. The general opinion is said to be that the proposal will not help in Africa, though it is very helpful to have ordained men attached to the Church's educational and medical institutions.

The possibility of having Auxiliary Clergy does not seem to have been considered much in Nigeria, and one is assured that neither the clergy nor the laity want the clergy to engage in non-ecclesiastical work, and still less, it is implied, to ordain men in farming, commerce, and so on. One African denomination lets its ministers trade, but their ecclesiastical work suffers; the Muslims all have full-time *imams*, and so the Christian clergy also are expected to give all their time to their ecclesiastical duties. In one area, however, where it is not easy to find men suitable for ordination who speak the local language, the experiment is being tried of ordaining simple men of little formal education who, while continuing to farm, will perform pastoral duties among their own people; but it is too early to appraise the value of this plan. It is pointed out that problems of loyalty will arise with Auxiliary Clergy. An English priest who knows Africa well has drawn attention[1] to the spiritual starvation of congregations there through the shortage of pastors, and this shortage, he says, is due largely to the Church having an educational rather than a spiritual basis for ordination. He sees the solution in

ordaining large numbers of clergy, farmers in the villages, clerks and shopkeepers in the towns. This would resemble the Muslim custom in some countries of having in each village a number of clergy, living as cultivators or traders, and of whom the merest smattering of the *Qur'-an* and a knowledge of the regulations of Islam is required.

There are proposals in the diocese of Mombasa for training assistant clergy for the larger parishes, and it is anticipated that some of these may well be voluntary and presumably Auxiliary in our sense. In the South Sudan, some Africans have suggested the use of Auxiliary Clergy, but it is said that both the clergy and the laity would be divided about the desirability of it, and that the keener members of the clergy would be against it. The Muslims have *imams* who are whole-time religious officials, so it is expected that Christian clergy will not also be something else.

On the other hand, it appears that the idea of a pastor and "pastoral work" is very foreign to the Irani with his Shia Muslim outlook. The pastor has no status in the community, and so it is argued that it is essential for him to have some other position or work which will give him standing in the community and with the government, and prevent suspicion as to what he is doing; otherwise he is taken to be a mysterious foreign agent, or at least a lazy parasite on society. An Irani priest, however, has urged[2] that it is is very dangerous to allow pastors to earn their living by work outside the Church, and that if anything of the sort is necessary, the work should be such as book-binding, book-selling, and translation work done within the Church's own structure and for the Church.

There has been more concern over the use of Auxiliary Clergy in India than in most countries, at any rate if we include the Church of South India. Here, too, however, opinion is very much divided over the desirability of the suggestion. A priest from North India expressed the opinion that the system would not suit India, which considers that the ecclesiastical or sacred and the secular should be kept separate. Where one is told that there are Auxiliary Clergy, one often finds on further investigation that those concerned are senior men who have retired from other professions, or else are on the staff of educational institutions, and so are not really relevant to our inquiry. But the situation is extremely pressing, especially in view of the urgency of dispensing quickly with financial help from abroad, and of the many scattered village groups of churchpeople

whose economic resources are exceedingly limited. Accordingly, several dioceses in the C.S.I. have inaugurated experiments which will lead to the ordination of village leaders as honorary presbyters: but it is as yet too early to draw conclusions from them. In one of them, the men concerned, who are mostly farmers with little formal education, have nine training courses each lasting ten days, spread over three years, and it is hoped that at the end at least the majority may be ordained.

Even here, however, there is much doubt and opposition. It is said that when one bishop, not an Indian, who is a keen advocate of the proposal, wanted his synod to discuss it, the synod was unwilling to do so, and it was only by an episcopal stratagem of putting on a special session of synod that the matter was discussed. It is sometimes claimed that on the whole the clergy are against the proposal, but the laity for it, and that the former may be actuated by feelings of professional jealousy. But it is also said, in reference to one diocese which has a strong element of well-educated laity, that the latter would not stand such simple village clergy.

It seems to be fairly clear that in some situations the ordination of Auxiliary Clergy is the only solution. But the question clearly bristles with difficulty. An English Free Church mission secretary, on a tour of India, was made most uneasy by the attitude in which some more educated men in the towns were seeking ordination as honorary presbyters, thinking in terms of power and prestige, rather than service: and this feeling is shared by others. It is pointed out, also, that the proposal is in direct contradiction to the tendency of our times to more specialization: modern religious movements within Hinduism are coming more and more to use trained professional and whole-time service. It may be added that the scheme of Union in North India provides for Auxiliary Clergy.

About forty years ago, in the Karen hills in Burma, there was for some years a system by which each village clergyman received a small salary but also had land which he farmed. This was given up when enough fully trained and whole time clergy became available: moreover, the numbers of churchpeople were not such as to constitute a problem, as in South India. The experience, however, did reveal certain difficulties and drawbacks: the village priest-farmers were not given enough training, they tended to take Sunday services only, and transfers of clergy were made difficult.

There is perhaps more actual experience of Auxiliary Clergy in

Hongkong than anywhere else, though the circumstances are utterly different from those of the villages of South India. Briefly, Hongkong has about a dozen whole-time (stipendiary) clergy, of whom only two are university graduates, while there are fourteen Auxiliary Clergy, almost all of whom are university graduates; the latter are almost all in education or in government service, only one being in commerce, industry, or farming (though one, now retired, was an Auxiliary priest while superintendent chief engineer for a big shipping firm). The Auxiliary Clergy all technically serve either the diocese or some school, and are not attached to parishes, because of the possibility of straining the relation between the whole-time clergy and their parishioners. Anglican opinion in Hongkong approves of the plan (which, however, is criticized by the local Free Churches); but it appears that opinion even here would probably not favour the clergy engaging in profit-making business. The length of training varies considerably, and the auxiliary clergy receive less supervision than do the full-time clergy. It is felt that the system brings the experience of other walks of life into the Church, but the main point is that the Church just could not have their help as clergy, if they were not financially independent: they make possible a truer proportion of priests to laity than is achieved otherwise except by either celibacy or endowments. It is thought by some that there are certain drawbacks: their help to the parishes is usually occasional and irregular, and most of them do not "belong" to the organization and life of the parish; their training in theology and *pastoralia* and their knowledge of actual parochial problems, is inadequate. It is admitted that they are no more than ordained lay readers: they do not in fact do much except take services. The inadequate number of full-time clergy means that, despite the auxiliary clergy, the congregations are not adequately taught and shepherded. Nevertheless, the system is felt, so far as it goes, to give valuable help to the Church.

There has for a number of years been discussion of Auxiliary Clergy in China. There is no parallel in non-Christian China to the Christian ministry, and clergy and ministers have no recognized position or status in the community. So, not surprisingly, it is sometimes questioned whether the Church need really burden herself with the support of whole-time clergy; and those men who were ordained have often preferred a teaching post, as giving them a respected place in society. This question, that is, conviction of the

value of the whole-time ministry, has naturally been much less acute among Anglicans than among Free Churchmen. The writer remembers discussing the question during the war with Bishop Lindel Tsen, who was later Chairman of the House of Bishops. Bishop Tsen was emphatic that the Church could not get on without a professional ministry, and that voluntary clergy could at most be exceptions—even this was not like Old China, which had no ministry at all. The Church should be very slow and careful in ordaining those who would continue in secular work—this could be a great danger and temptation to the Church in China, where it was not easy to keep straight in business. During the war, incidentally, financial difficulties forced numbers of Chinese clergy to take up non-ecclesiastical work, sometimes in commerce; but on the whole the results do not seem to have been such as to encourage such a practice except in case of extreme need: all too often the ecclesiastical work came to be given less and less attention. One gathers that though the Church in China under the Communist regime has abruptly had to dispense with all foreign financial aid, and in consequence some of the clergy have to undertake non-ecclesiastical work, the Church tries herself to finance the majority of them.

It is reported that in some villages in Korea, men are to be ordained to a part-time (Auxiliary) diaconate, with the expectation that they will eventually be priested, while remaining non-stipendiary, and presumably engaged in farming or the like.

In Japan, numbers of clergy are in fact engaged in a variety of non-ecclesiastical occupations—they are clerks, interpreters, teachers, civil servants, one is even a fisherman; but this seems to be entirely a matter of economic necessity affecting those trained as clergy, and does not mean that men in other occupations are ordained with the idea of continuing in them: it is commonly assumed that a priest is a fully-trained specialist who should devote all his time and energies to the specific work of the Church. It is said that the Japanese laity would not take kindly to the ministrations of non-professional clergy. But the country people especially are so poor, and the numbers of churchpeople so small, that there would seem perhaps to be a need for a recognized system of non-stipendiary clergy. As in China, a whole-time ministry which has to be supported by believers is a new conception.

A recent meeting of the Singapore diocesan synod discussed the

possibility of the ordination of Auxiliary Clergy somewhat inconclusively. There is some desire for such help as voluntary clergy might be able to give, and the Bishop seems to be considering seriously the ordination of such men. An eminent Asian priest surprisingly suggested that the difficulty could be solved by creating something like a Church Army, under orders, working in the villages, having authority and responsibility to look after the village congregations. It was, in answer to this, pointed out that there were already lay readers, catechists, and evangelists who were commissioned by the Church, and that something new was needed.

It seems likely that the diocese of Polynesia may soon have Auxiliary Clergy. Elsewhere there seems in the South Pacific to be little movement toward ordaining Auxiliary Clergy in the proper sense (that is, for example, not just permanent deacons), though the possibility has not infrequently been discussed, usually informally, both in New Zealand and Australia.

Other Christian Communions do not seem to have much useful experience to contribute to the discussion. Rome allows priests to derive their livelihood from a non-ecclesiastical source only in an emergency and quite exceptionally under strict regulations, and so as not to interfere with their ecclesiastical duties; the ordination of priests without the full normal professional training has hardly been mooted. An article in a Roman Catholic journal, however, has suggested that men who would continue in non-ecclesiastical occupations might be made deacon, and allowed, in places where a Sunday Mass is not celebrated, to give Communion and preach: they would not, of course, be under any obligation to celibacy.

It is well-known that the village clergy in the Greek Orthodox Church are mostly also farmers; it is perhaps not so well known that since 1909 they have also received a small stipend from central Church funds— increased in 1949; the tendency, that is, is in the reverse direction to that suggested among ourselves. And it appears that in Russia nowadays when a priest is ordained he gives up whatever non-ecclesiastical occupation he may have had before.

None of the Free Churches seem to have an exact equivalent to Anglican Auxiliary Clergy, nor does any such suggestion seem to have been very widely considered, though an English Methodist has recently urged[3] that some men in secular employment should be ordained as ministers not of the Word but of the Sacraments. A Congregationalist theologian expressed the view to me that a man

should not be ordained unless he expects to give his whole time (and his whole life) to ministerial work: a part-time pastor would not be ordained, but would administer the sacraments. Some of the Free Churches have "lay pastors", and insist that the laity may celebrate the Lord's Supper; but even so at least sometimes a layman may not do so without a solemn commissioning, and he should then perhaps be regarded as in effect an Auxiliary priest.

The "Sects", Pentecostalist and other, seem to depend on whole-time salaried pastors much more than one would have expected; and the tendency for them certainly seems to be to develop theological colleges and a full-time paid and trained ministry. For that matter, even the secular humanists, at least in the U.S.A., the American Ethical Union, are developing whole-time professional counsellors and leaders.

As one considers reactions from various countries to the proposal for Auxiliary Clergy, one cannot but feel that some doubts and criticisms are simply due to the novelty of the idea. On both sides, questionable arguments are used. It is not always clear just how we are to maintain a right reverence for holy things without falling into a false and un-Christian dichotomy between sacred and secular. And it is difficult to discuss at the same time the highly educated professional men in Hongkong and the simple farmers in South India.

When all is said on both sides, it remains the case that Auxiliary Clergy could celebrate the Eucharist where otherwise churchpeople would be deprived of it, but that otherwise they would not contribute appreciably to pastoral care and nurture. Experience shows that ordination does not enable or stimulate them to give more time than they could or would as laymen, and in fact they do little but take services. In some countries at least more pastoral care in the general sense is needed. A recent writer[4] refers to the nominal Christianity of very many villagers in Uganda, and considers that they have suffered by being left with no properly trained pastoral care or teaching or supervision; it looks as if both more whole-time clergy and more active (and trained) laity are needed. Auxiliary clergy, if there were many of them, might easily suggest that the laity can have no active share in the pastoral and evangelistic work of the Church. Clearly they are not the solution of the Church's difficulties, but it should be possible to have some such clergy, and in places such as South India they may well, as things are, be in-

dispensable. They may well be part of the solution, provided that they function always within the framework of the principle that every member of the Church has and should fulfil his own vocation and ministry—here alone is the ultimate solution.

[1] J. S. Trimingham in *The Christian Church and Islam in West Africa*, 1955.

[2] H. B. Dehqani-Tofti in *International Review of Missions*, July 1955.

[3] J. Lawson in *Green and Pleasant Land.*

[4] J. V. Taylor in *International Review of Missions*, April 1957.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,—I should be glad of the opportunity to correct a possible ambiguity in my article in your issue of January-March on "Episcopal-Presbyterian Relations." When on page 9, I say that, if the distinction between orders and jurisdiction had been more clearly recognized, it would have been possible to make more concessions to the Presbyterians in the realm of church order, I mean by "church order" church *organization*. Church order in this sense does not fall within the sphere of *orders* but of *jurisdiction*.

E. L. MASCALL

Christ Church,
Oxford.

REVIEWS

EXISTENTIALISM

EXISTENTIALISM AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF. By DAVID E. ROBERTS. Ed. ROGER HAZELTON. Oxford University Press. 30s.

DAVID ROBERTS, the author of this book, was Marcellus Hartley Professor of the Philosophy of Religion at Union Theological Seminary New York. He was, we are told, "among the very first American thinkers to take existentialism into account", and the book was well on its way to completion at his untimely death early in 1955. Roger Hazelton, now of Pomona College, Claremont, California, has edited the book, adding a concluding section and completing an unfinished Introduction and one or two chapters.

For the most part the book is a survey of six thinkers who each in his own way belongs to the movement known as existentialism, and in his discussion of each of them the author seeks to show the bearing of this movement on the pattern of contemporary religious thought.

There is Blaise Pascal—"the most important precursor of modern existentialism"—who attacked rationalism, but collided with orthodoxy —"a strange mixture of pride and humility, of scientific acuteness and saintly devotion". Then comes Kierkegaard with his emphasis on the limitations of "objective thinking", though perhaps he was too critical of the possibility of a metaphysics which might "do justice to such categories as anxiety, guilt, decision, and mystery without falling into either idealistic or realistic forms of objectivism". Thirdly, there is Heidegger who, while he seeks an ontology and has "Being" for a key-word, is critical of Theism: at any rate of "the sort of theology . . . which treats God as if He were *a* being" (p. 190). Next we have Sartre who, concentrating on "interpersonal situations" sees the relation between myself and other persons in such situations as being "essentially one of isolation from each other and conflict with each other." "Even though I were to learn everything which can be known about another person as object, I could never control him because his freedom, his subject-hood, is inaccessible." Here is the isolation. "Yet because the reality of the other person is an unconquerable intrusion into 'my' world which threatens to turn me into his object, my only recourse is to counter attack by trying to turn him into 'my' object." Hence also the conflict. Can the Christian give a better account of "human freedom"? Here is the challenge. Fifthly there is Jaspers who more than anyone else emphasizes the difficulty there must always be for either philosophy or religion if we can allow for no *via media* between "universally valid, objective knowledge, which is confined to phenomena, non-existential,

scientific" on the one hand, and "unconditional commitment, which is 'absolute' in the sense that it calls for total response on the part of the whole man", something "which is at the same time inescapably individual" (p. 268). Finally, Marcel, who concentrating on interpersonal relations differs from Sartre in finding there something "mysterious", a "participation" which saves something from the bonfire of traditional metaphysics.

From these six representatives what do we discover as to the specific bearing of "existentialism" on religious belief? The concluding chapter makes a number of suggestions. *Negatively*: the movement can be seen as a corrective to "an uncritical adulation of science" which might suppose that scientific categories were by themselves adequate for an understanding of human life and existence. Again, not only the scientist, but also the traditional philosophical theologian comes in for criticism; for the movement "embodies a deep-seated distrust of all efforts to compel religious belief through the devising of arguments or so-called 'proofs' for the reality of God". *More positively*: it underlines "the dark forces of sin, despair and death". No fair-weather, facile optimism about it. Again, it encourages us as we have seen to reformulate the doctrine of human freedom. Finally "existentialism can contribute significantly to our understanding of the vexed relationship between faith and reason". For if it makes us critical of "rational structure, logical system or universal meaning", it also shows us "that metaphysics or ontology may speak inside the vivid, concrete, personal language of drama and poetry", and so "opens the way toward a concordat between faith and philosophic reason which Kierkegaard himself could scarcely have envisaged". Out of the approach of Jaspers and Marcel "may actually come a new and constructive form of Christian philosophy". Here is the issue which above all others is of crucial contemporary importance. We may expose its significance like this: much of the irrationalism which has characterized theology in recent years may be seen as a reaction against the well-meant but compromising claims of the metaphysicians of a past day. If a reasonable Christianity had to be such as Hegel supplied, the Christian Faith might understandably rejoice in finding itself unreasonable. Let not only the Greek, but the Absolute Idealist, be received with caution, despite the gifts he claims to bring.

Now existentialism (strong in Europe) and logical empiricism (strong in Great Britain) are one in being critical of the pretension of the older metaphysics. Further, existentialism specializes in those curiously complex situations which might well save empiricism from being too restricted in its scope, too limited in its perspective. Can there then emerge a new metaphysics from the richer empiricism which the existentialists might help to create?

This book leaves the question open. On the one hand, existentialism may have done its job if it has helped us "to probe more sharply and closely to the heart of our own faith" when "we shall find that our commitment is deepened into conviction, and conviction broadened into comprehension of the strange ways of God, whose very absence is a

kind of presence and whose silence is a mysterious mode of speaking to us". On the other hand, the book goes further when it encourages us to think that a Christian philosophy could include existentialist insights without despising "science and objective reason": "A Christian philosophy, once it has come to terms with what existentialism has to teach it, may well pay more sympathetic heed to the constructive role which science and objective reason are able to play in serving the truly spiritual ends of individual and communal living." Heim and von Weiszäker are given as examples of those working to this end.

There is also the hint that the lesson of existentialism may be that "metaphysics or ontology may speak inside the vivid, concrete, personal language of drama and poetry." If so, perhaps we may conclude that the new metaphysics will arise when we are more able to set within one total language scheme the logical moves appropriate to drama and poetry as well as those which characterize "science and objective reason". Whether we succeed or not in these logical placings is a matter of life and death for contemporary civilization.

I. T. Ramsey

HISTORY AND REVELATION

From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process. By William Foxwell Albright. Doubleday Anchor Books. New York. $1.45.

A new and revised edition of Professor Albright's well-known volume will be welcomed by all who are acquainted with this quite remarkable book. There is no other comparable survey of religious thought and practice in its cultural setting in the Ancient Middle East from Palaeolithic times to the rise of Christianity, written for the most part from first-hand knowledge of archaeological and philological investigation in this vast field of specialized learning and inquiry. Although it has been thrice revised and reprinted since it was first published in 1940, certainly the time has come for a new edition to bring it up to date in view of the accumulation of evidence that has become available in recent years, involving considerable re-interpretation of former conclusions and conjectures. Much of this has been noted and discussed in the Introduction to the present Edition, but a more detailed and revised documentation in the text would have added to its value, to say nothing of biblical references, which are seldom supplied. This last mentioned omission is particularly surprising in a book that sets out in some measure at any rate, to rehabilitate the traditional interpretation of the Old Testament in general and of a Mosaic monotheism in particular.

While maintaining a conservative critical approach Albright still defends, he says, "the substantial historicity of patriarchal tradition"

without any appreciable change in his point of view, and, as in 1940, he insists on "the primacy of oral tradition over written literature". He has not surrendered "a single position with regard to early Israelite monotheism". Indeed, in spite of Professor T. J. Meek's critical appraisal of his contention in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* in 1942, he considers "the Mosaic tradition as even more reliable" than he did then. In regard to the development of the social and political institutions of Israel he is now convinced that Israelite Law and religious institutions are older and more continuous than he supposed, and therefore, he has in fact become more conservative in his attitude to the Mosaic tradition and to the effects of the Covenant on the social and political life of the community. He insists more vigorously on the Prophets as predictors of the course of history; their utterances having been conformed, he claims, by the pattern of events. Finally, he maintains the basic character of the "Greek revolution" in the Hellenistic Age and its effects on Judaism in, and after, the third century B.C., leading up to the rise of Christianity "in the fulness of time".

Account is taken of the Dead Sea Scrolls which he admits have revealed details hitherto unknown. Nevertheless it is still held that both the Sadducees and Pharisees had been hellenized in vital respects before the Incarnation, and that the Essenes came from Mesopotamia in the second century B.C. It was they and their congeners, he believes, rather than the larger Jewish sects who influenced Christianity, but in the light of the Scrolls he lays greater stress than formerly on the continuity of the Old and New Testaments, and on "the indissoluble bond between pre-Christian Judaism and early Christianity". The concluding section devoted to Christian origins, however, attempts the impossible and achieves little, being a superficial survey of the documentary sources and of form-criticism, together with that of the Christian conception of Deity, the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, his Virgin Birth, and eschatology, compressed within the space of twenty small pages.

As is to be expected, it is when Professor Albright is dealing with the archaeological background of the Ancient Near East that he is at his best, and then he is as interesting as he is highly illuminating (*pace* the use of such terms as skeuomorphism, amphictyonic, phantasmagoria, which may puzzle the Greekless general reader). What he has to say about the data now available in the Fertile Crescent and the interpretation of this material is very significant, although it is rather surprising that in the reconstruction of the ancient cult in Western Asia more attention has not been given to such sites as Tepe Gawra, Tell Hassuna, Al 'Ubaid, Uruk, Ur Uqair, and Khafaje, in view of their contribution to our knowledge of the earlier phases of Near Eastern religion. This, however, is hardly the place to discuss an aspect of a volume that is packed with information which archaeologists will assess as a compendium of very high value and accuracy.

So far as Palestine and the Old Testament are concerned, here again it is the light thrown on the course of events in the Near East in the Early and Middle Bronze Age that makes this a book that serious students of

the Hebrew scriptures cannot afford to neglect. Precisely how the biblical narratives and episodes are to be fitted into this setting, and interpreted in relation to the historical situation and contemporary beliefs and practices, are matters upon which the debate is likely to continue. While Professor Albright's conclusions certainly will have to be given the consideration they merit, some of them raise more problems than they solve. Few who are acquainted with the evidence will go so far as is here suggested concerning the historicity of the Patriarchal narratives and their personnel, or a Mosaic universalistic conception of Deity, while it has to be recognized that almost insuperable difficulties are encountered in any attempt to reconcile the biblical traditions with the archaeological data in respect of the Exodus and its date. The same applies to the Israelite conquest and occupation of Palestine, and the precise identification of the elusive Hyksos and their relation to the Hebrews. These are but a few of the contentious questions discussed in this provocative volume upon which the last word has yet to be spoken, if indeed that is ever possible. Nevertheless this is a book of first-rate importance alike for the expert and the general reader.

E. O. James

THE NATURE OF FAITH

Dynamics of Faith. By Paul Tillich. Allen and Unwin. 9s. 6d.

This book is one of the series on "World Perspectives" and fulfils its purpose with outstanding success. Tillich has a firm grasp of essentials, a power of lucid expression, and marshalls his argument with close-knit logic.

The theme of the book is that faith is the total commitment of the whole personality to ultimate concern. Everyone, it is obvious, has something which for him is ultimate; to which all else is subordinated. Hence the necessity to discover what is the true object of ultimate concern. This object must be: (1) Unconditional and absolute; (2) infinite; (3) holy. Hence there is involved tremendous risk in raising to the rank of the unconditional and ultimate that which has not these qualities. The world to-day is full of idolatrous concerns. Some worship the nation; others success; others wealth. But none of these objects can satisfy the whole personality; and this dissatisfaction leads to breakdown and disintegration.

In faith the subject-object relation is transcended: faith involves participation in its object. Hence it can never be an activity of the reason in isolation, nor of the will, nor of the emotions. There is no antagonism between reason and true faith, which is far other than a determination to believe something supported only by inadequate evidence.

Faith is ecstasy. "Ecstasy is fulfilled, not denied, rationality. Reason can be fulfilled only if it is driven beyond the limits of its finitude, and experiences the presence of the ultimate, the holy" (p. 77). Faith expresses itself in symbol and myth. Symbols partake in the nature of that which they denote, as a flag participates in the majesty of a nation. Myth is the setting forth of the intermingling and interaction of the infinite and the finite, of the divine and the human. Hence there are religious truths that can be set forth only in symbol and myth. When men have worshipped the symbol, or tried to give ultimacy to the myth, there has been a distortion of faith. The Bible is the expression of man's ultimate concern, but not the concern itself.

Faith can admit an element of doubt, because it must be uncertain "in so far as the infinite to which it is related is received by a finite being". To accept this uncertainty, and at the same time to live by the certainty which comes from the grasp of the holy, is courage. Faith is a life: a dynamic life, giving victory over the world.

It would be tempting to quote many an instance of the sentences in this book which light up old and insistent questions, set the reader on the right track for further thought, or appear to set a long debate at rest. But enough has, I trust, been said to show that this is a mature book, full of vital thinking, which will inspire every reader to fruitful pondering and devoted living.

C. J. Barker

GIFFORD LECTURES

On Selfhood and Godhood. By C. A. Campbell. Allen and Unwin. 35s.

It is instructive to apply to this book, containing the Gifford Lectures 1953-5, the useful, if not always very fair principle, a man shall be known by his friends. When discussing the nature of human cognition, the author refers to Absolute Idealism as "a philosophy that has for some time been rumoured to be defunct," and writes: "To the best of my knowledge, it is only in mode of presentation, not in substance, that my answer differs from that given seventy odd years ago by F. H. Bradley and Bernard Bosanquet." He describes Henry Sidgwick's *Method of Ethics* as "a work, which must have a fair claim to rank as the best ethical treatise in the English language". His highest praise is given to Rudolf Otto, who is called "by a wide margin, the most illuminating religious thinker of modern times".

As might be expected from these references, the allusions to movements of thought since their time are mainly critical. Thus Professor Campbell speaks of his "inability to do obeisance to the twin gods of so much recent British philosophy—empiricism and linguisticism." We

may sense the Utopianism of the early years of the century, rather than the later reaction against it, when he disclaims "the proposition that in human nature as we know it there is a native bias towards evil", and adds, "if this premise is false, as I firmly believe it to be, the problem of sin to which the Fall is offered as a solution just does not arise". While he recognises "elements of profound and permanent value" in "the powerful neo-Calvinist trend in recent theology", it is not surprising on this background that he questions the implications of that theology for the doctrine of man.

It will be evident that Professor Campbell's lectures have more in common with the thought of an earlier generation, than with more recent writing; and he refers at one place himself to his "own (as usual, old-fashioned) view". Yet time does not, of necessity, make ancient good uncouth. The book is all the more important, if in many respects it does not run counter to current trends.

The first half of the book argues for the soul as a spiritual substance, partly on the ground that cognition implies a cognizing subject, and partly from "the metaphysical implications of accepting the moral consciousness as having objective validity". In a recent book, Professor Tillich has pointed out that it is characteristic of the anxiety of the modern world to fear that life is meaningless. In such a world it is encouraging to find a Gifford lecturer conclude his study of the self by saying: "Certainly to know that a moral order belongs to the very nature of things, and is no mere figment of man's imagination, is not to know everything we should like to know about this universe in which we find ourselves. But it *is* to know (or so it seems to me) that which effectively eliminates the most haunting of those ultimate fears that chill the heart of reflective man; the fear that human existence has no meaning or purpose beyond itself."

The second half of the book, which contains the lectures on Godhood, argues that a rational theism is self-contradictory, but argues for a supra-rational or symbolic theism. This second course of lectures contains a somewhat Pelagian chapter on sin, a rather stronger chapter on suffering, and a useful section on the nature of symbolic thought about God. The Christian who daily prays, thy will be done, will find it hard to agree that there are "intractable difficulties" in ascribing will or purpose to God. There seems at this point to be a possible flaw in the argument. Professor Campbell writes: "In the typical conation the conative subject envisages a state of affairs not yet existing which he conceives to be better than the state of affairs that now exists. The imperfection of the subject's present state thus seems to be of conation's very essence." If however we allow, as the writer would, that God as Creator gives to the created world a delegated freedom, and that this freedom has been misused, then surely the imperfection may exist in the objective world, not in God as subject; and a perfect God may regard his world with a plan and purpose of redemptive love.

This comment points to a defect in the treatment of theism, which Professor Campbell does not himself remedy within the pages of this

book, though at least he leaves the door open for the remedy. As he himself recognises in the closing pages with a reference to Kierkegaard: "The god of the philosophers is not the god of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." The living God, who speaks and acts from his side according to the biblical revelation, has qualities which we do not find in the ultimate reality of Absolute Idealism, nor indeed necessarily in awe before the *mysterium tremendum fascinans*. To say this however is to pass from philosophy to theology, to abandon knowledge and make room for faith. So far as Professor Campbell's book is concerned, we are left with the statement that philosophy can "neither sustain nor refute" the direct experience of the Divine presence. The door is not closed; and a philosophic approach can be a preparation for the Gospel, but cannot itself take the place of the revelation in the Gospel.

✠ GEOFFREY ALLEN

SACRIFICE

LAMB TO THE SLAUGHTER. By Brother GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M. James Clarke. 7s. 6d.

THIS very original little book consists of Passiontide Lectures delivered at Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln. The author had long been fascinated by *The Golden Bough* and the works of Jane Harrison. He was inclined to deplore the decay of natural religion in Christendom and the slow disappearance of piety towards holy things and places. The invitation to deliver these lectures gave him an incentive to study more closely the origins of sacrifice, which he finds go back further than any other religious institution. Christianity includes elements derived from agricultural and hunting rites. Man's understanding of the issues involved in Christian belief—Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection—is vitally concerned with his estimate of the sacrificial idea. A false or exaggerated idea of substitution has been fostered by the practice of Low Masses without general Communion, consisting of an altercation between priest and server. Palaeolithic painting shows the hunter slaying the beast to share his strength. Sacrifice involves the death of the victim whose flesh and blood are required to renew the fertility of the soil and the fecundity of the tribe. Ritual is older than myth and myth than theology, but sacrifice of some kind may well be older even than the idea of a personal god. Calvary was a stumbling block to the Jews and to the Greeks foolishness, but familiar foolishness, another oriental mystery, the precise difference of which from the rest was not initially apparent. But in reality in Calvary, the Eucharist and the Resurrection "types and shadows have their ending", and myth gives place to history. Islam played an important part in forcing Christian theologians to develop a theory of sacrifice and a doctrine of Atonement, to explain

why God chose such a painful way of becoming reconciled to sinful man. In Brother George's view the real barrier to the progress of the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Church is the customs and revenues connected with Requiems—and the Reformed Churches have been too ready to regard the Cross itself as a propitiatory offering without reference to the Resurrection and Ascension, and little connection between sacrifice and Communion. In the last few pages there is some fine writing about the participation of the faithful in Christ's sacrifice, summing up the theme of the book. "No other religion . . . has taken half so seriously the solidarity of all men in guilt, of the slayers of Christ with those who stoned the Prophets, and of Christians with the crowds, who shouted 'Hosanna' and 'Crucify', with the Apostles, who followed and fled. We are the sinners who killed Christ, but he says 'Father, forgive them,' and conveys to us his life."

FREDERIC HOOD

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

CHURCH DOGMATICS, Vol. II, Part I: The Doctrine of God. By KARL BARTH. T. & T. Clark. 55s.

LET me confess at the outset that as I attempt to review this book I find myself almost completely mystified. Is this the Barth who rang a bell and started a revolution in European theology? Is this the Barth who recalled us to the strange new world of the Bible and pioneered in the field of Biblical theology? Is this the Barth who gave us a fresh sense of the activity of the living God and of his direct speech to men through his Word? Here we find a massive system of verbal architecture establishing the twin towers of "The Knowledge of God" and "The Reality of God": I have not found it easy to hear any ringing of bells. Here is a most complex theology of abstract forms and verbal concepts: the Biblical expositions are, it would appear, appendages to the abstractions rather than their controls. And it is strange to read in the first paragraph of the Editors' Preface that for Barth the whole of revelation is summed up in the statement that "God is".

What is the appeal of this theology? That Barth himself must have spent an incredible amount of labour in building up these parts of his system goes without saying. It would be an impertinence to question his vast knowledge of the Bible, the Fathers and of medieval and post-Reformation theology. But what is he doing as he pours out words, words, words—repetitions, negative safeguards, qualifications, synonyms, alternative ways of saying the same thing? Again that his translators must have given themselves with the utmost devotion to the enormous task of rendering into very readable English a most complicated script also goes without saying. But for whom are they translating? Is there any considerable number of students who will go

faithfully through these volumes and gain stimulus and enrichment thereby? I am frankly puzzled. The only parallel which suggests itself to me is that of the full score of a great symphony. I might study it and it would mean nothing to me. But I know that a select few could be found who would stay with the score, would hear its melodies in their inner consciousness and would go on their way with the sense of having shared in a great experience. Can it be that the translators and readers of the Church Dogmatics are gaining inspiration of this kind?

I suppose that the matter which baffles me most is Barth's use of non-biblical words—such words as objectivity, Subject, absolute, omnicausality, immutability, annihilation, and so on. Take for example the discussion of the unity of God. We are told that if we understand it rightly we can express all that God is by saying that God is One. But then we are suddenly confronted by the statement that: "The word oneness has two meanings. It can mean both uniqueness and simplicity", and we are off on an exposition of God's uniqueness (which is not very enlightening seeing that it boils down to the affirmation that God is unique in a way that is itself unique and cannot be denoted by any concept) and of God's simplicity. But by what authority does Barth conclude that the word oneness has two meanings? Certainly not biblical authority. Philosophical authority? But what philosophy? I can understand a theologian determining to stay within the bounds of the Biblical vocabulary and terminology and saying that all other words drawn from Greek and Latin cultures are taboo. But I simply cannot understand a man using human words to which an arbitrary meaning is attached to build a theology of the Word of God. And indeed this has been my fundamental difficulty with Barth for a long time: how can you use language at all without being straightway involved in problems of history, culture, nature, art which all the time Barth is doing his best to avoid?

The book itself consists of two main chapters. The first on "The Knowledge of God" deals mainly with the knowability of God. The second on "The Reality of God" takes in a wider range of subjects: the Being of God as the One who loves in Freedom, the Grace and Holiness of God, his Mercy and Righteousness, his Patience and Wisdom. The indexes have been carefully prepared. Translators and Publishers are to be congratulated upon a finely produced book, and in spite of all reservations and perplexities about the content I hope I may have grace to recognize the struggle of a great mind to bear witness to what he has apprehended of the sovereign grace of God.

F. W. Dillistone

BIOLOGY AND FAITH

EVOLUTIONARY THEORY AND CHRISTIAN BELIEF: THE UNRESOLVED CONFLICT. By DAVID LACK. Methuen. 10s. 6d.

THIS book is particularly welcome because the number of biologists who have written on the question of the relation of Science to Christianity is very small, while the problems arising for the Christian are much more acute and fundamental in the field of biology than in that of physical science. Dr Lack, F.R.S., Reader in Ornithology in the University of Oxford, is very qualified to write on biological subjects, and his book is the more valuable because it is written in a simple and delightful manner and with great fairness of mind. He has no "party-line" to defend, except that of the Darwinians with their belief in the complete sufficiency of Natural Selection. His purpose is to insist that Natural Selection must be accepted as the sole mechanism and force at work in the production of biological evolution, and that once this has been frankly recognized it must be admitted that an unresolved conflict exists in many respects between the views of biologists and the beliefs of Christians. He begins by a brief, diverting, and very fair summary of the Victorian battle between T. H. Huxley and Samuel Wilberforce, and its aftermath, pointing out that the presentation of this by most modern historians of Science has been unfair to Wilberforce and to other churchmen concerned. He then gives a most valuable outline of the present evidence for the evolution of *Homo Sapiens*, after which he discusses the relation of this to the truth of Genesis, and rightly concludes that for most Christians this is no longer a serious issue. In the next two Chapters he expounds and vindicates the Theory of Natural Selection—"the evolution of animals from pre-existing forms by the natural selection of hereditary variations"—and dismisses all suggestions that Natural Selection is not the complete and sole explanation of Evolution. Here he states that such conceptions as "A Life Force", "Creative Evolution", and a "Holistic Urge" are all criticisms of Natural Selection. The Christian would agree that efforts to find the explanation of the driving force in evolution in a blind "Life Force" are to be rejected; but he is bound to dissent from the view that there is no directive agent or purpose in evolution. Not that the biologist should seek to find this in his own studies, and the question whether Natural Selection is an adequate explanation of all the phenomena of evolution is one to be decided on scientific grounds. But when the biologist rules out, as J. S. Huxley does, the very idea of a purpose behind evolution, he is going outside his province. Dr Lack does not quite do this, though he sometimes comes near it; but in the end he suggests quite rightly that Natural Selection is itself a scientific "law" through which God achieves his purpose. But we feel that he is rather too ready to sweep aside all evidence of "directiveness" in nature; and it is a pity he did not refer to the recent books by the eminent American botanist E. W. Sinnott, especially *The Biology of the Spirit* (1956), which give various very

striking examples of such purposiveness. Dr Lack next considers the struggle for existence, and death and pain in Nature. He seems to think that Christians find death in itself a problem, but surely this is not so. It is pain and suffering in the higher animals and the ravages of disease which are hard to reconcile with a God of Love. Dr Lack's treatment of this must seem rather superficial to anyone with pastoral experience; and he does not recognize that biologists such as Sherrington and T. H. Huxley have found this as great a moral problem as Christians have done. Finally Dr Lack discusses the Nature of Man, and defends the view (which he wrongly supposes to be an article of faith for all Christians) that while man's body was evolved by Natural Selection his soul is a direct special creation by God. His argument against the possibility that the soul, like the body and mind, was evolved seems very dubious. But in these later chapters Dr Lack, who earlier has castigated some Christian apologists, turns and rends the exponents of "evolutionary ethics" with great zest and effect. As he says, his book is not intended to defend either Agnostic humanism or Christianity but to state the facts and questions fairly and honestly, and this it does well and simply, if from a rigid Darwinian standpoint. But it is, of course, true that Darwinianism is at present completely dominant and fashionable in biology, so that his book is very representative.

A. F. SMETHURST

[Canon Smethurst had not finished this review when he died. It was forwarded to us, as he left it, by his secretary.]

ISLAM

REVELATION AND REASON IN ISLAM. By A. J. ARBERRY. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

THERE is no doubt that Professor Arberry maintains the tradition of Cambridge Oriental scholarship, which his chair associates with the famous names of Browne and Nicholson. If the latter never went east of Paris, while the former spent his full "year among the Persians", together they set an example of the combination of Arabic with Persian which did not escape Arberry's immediate predecessor. In these Forwood Lectures for 1956, delivered in the University of Liverpool, the Orientalist and linguist has entered the realm of the theologian, the philosopher, the authoritarian, and the mystic. The book however needs no more *introduction* than does its author; and the lectures are presented to the reader as they were offered to the hearers. The notes at the close of each are sufficient evidence of erudition. There are naturally quotations, Qur'anic and otherwise, in every lecture. For the Qu'ran and sometimes

for other works the author's gift of felicitous expression comes into its own. He is concerned with the Islamic history of the "conflict or concord between reason and revelation"—a conflict not yet over for the two monotheistic faiths preceding Islam, inheriting, as the new faith, not only the great Christian centres in the Near East but the debates which had engaged both Jewish and Christian thinkers for many decades. In a century or less Alexandria was in touch with Mecca. It is a longer journey from Muhammad to Iqbal but the "flight" is attempted. There are well-known names through the centuries who fill in the canvas—from Ahmad ibn Hanbal, through Ash'ari and Ghazali, Ibn Hazam and Ibn Khaldun, to Hallaj and Bistami.

Most of the final lecture is devoted to the last named, probably less known than most who have followed the *Sufi* path. It provides an interesting study with the background of al-Bistami's "mother complex" (p. 92) and his subsequent anticipation of al-Hallaj with his exclamation "There is no truth but I am in it"—and our author holds that the mystic experience was genuine. Here then is an eighth century *Sufi* finding that the Divine was not as arbitrary as the study of the Qur'an had first led Muslims to expect. Was it then only at first sight that God as revealed to Muhammad seemed "uncompromisingly transcendent?" (p. 28). Long before the struggles of the Reformation or the more recent recrudescence men were debating the relative values of transcendence and immanence. Here is something to-day for a round table convocation between Muslims, Jews, and Christians in the flesh.

The Professor has occasional sentences that may require the reader to revise his judgements—it will be a shock to those who have come to regard Hujjat al-Islam, the author of the *Revival of Religious Sciences*, as beyond criticism to find him as capable of sinking to depths if not to rising to heights (p. 64). Timely too is the discussion of the Isma'ili Sect with its answer to the "questionings of anxious minds". Recent days have called attention to the widespread adherents of the Agha Khan. With an ancestry reaching back to the original Shi'ite split over the provenance of 'Ali, they remain one of the more influential groups outside the Orthodox Islamic fold. Will they fare better than the Sunnis in the "swellings of Jordan" with the diverse currents of religious and philosophical thinking? How long for many throughout the Islamic world will the authority of Avicenna and Averroes continue? Will there arise another Mu'tazilite School of thought?

In the Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Glasgow contemporaneously with those of Professor Arberry at Liverpool, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford devotes his first two lectures to a Theological and Philosophical Retrospect reaching back to 1912 and the new discipline of biblical criticism and the fading Hegelianism characteristic of the world of philosophy at the time. It may well be that the experience already gained by Christian thinking through the impact of the revival of the sciences will stand Islamic thinkers in good stead. It would not come amiss for readers of *Revelation and Reason in Islam* to turn to *For Faith and Freedom*. Christian and Muslim thinkers

alike, this century, will seek to bring their beliefs into harmony with experience and fact. There seems no cogent reason against the quest being pursued in co-operation. As Professor Arberry claims: "All variations need to be studied" (p. 7).

E. F. F. Bishop

BIBLE WORDS

Bible Words in Living Language. By Luther A. Weigle. Nelson. 10s. 6d.

This fascinating book by the Chairman of the (American) Standard Bible Committee, is a collection of brief articles on words in the Authorised Version which to-day do not reflect the real meanings of the Greek or Hebrew words. About 200 are dealt with, with the promise of a full length word book next year, containing, in alphabetical order, some 1,200 words and phrases which have been affected by changing English usage. The publication of the Revised Standard Version has done much to change most, if not all, of these obsolete words and a great many examples from it are given here, as well as some from the Soncino Edition of the Old Testament, and several from Coverdale, Tyndale, Wyclif, and the Great, Geneva, Bishops', and Douay Bibles, and more modern authorities like Kittel, Trench, Goodspeed, Moffat, Knox, Rieu, Weymouth, Torrey, and others. W. A. Wright, as always, is of course quoted, but no mention is made of Lumby's useful Glossary in the *Variorum* Teacher's Edition of the Holy Bible.

The page and a half devoted to "for", "with", "over", "on" and their redundancy is very interesting, and so are the references to the number of words which are not in the original, and often need not be used at all. The author is severe on the Authorised Version disposition, especially in the Old Testament, to use "even", "so", "as", and "unto", where there are no corresponding words for them in the Hebrew. To mention at haphazard a few words about which information may be new to non-students of orthology, the following may be given, "purchase", which does not involve the payment of money but merely means "acquire", "obtain", or "gain"; "peculiar" in the sense of "chosen" or "individual"; "quick" meaning "alive" or "lively"; "conversant", in Jos. 8. 25, almost tantamount to "fellow traveller"; "let" meaning "allow", "hinder", "approve", or "accept"; "prevent", to "anticipate" or to "hinder"; and the meaning of the guests at the marriage in Cana of Galilee who "wanted" wine, is really, as Tyndale version has it "when the wine failed", showing that the host had not forgotten to provide a supply, but that he had miscalculated the amount needed.

The only criticism to be made is that the index should be much fuller; to give a couple of examples only, "love", in addition to *agapé*, should

be inserted, and "man" as well as *'ish*, to say nothing of *'adam* and *gibbor, homo, vir, anthropos, aner.*

Those who read this review are strongly recommended to read the book itself and to recommend it to others, and then wait patiently for the appearance of the promised forthcoming full length *Bible Word Book.*

A. D. Power

TYPOLOGY

Essays on Typology. By G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

One could have wished that Professor Lampe had expanded his short essay on this important subject to a full-length monograph. A detailed analysis of the meaning and use of such terms as type, antitype, and example in the Old Testament, Septuagint, and New Testament, is much needed, and Professor Lampe is well-qualified to give it to us. The writings of Father Lionel Thornton and Dr A. M. Farrer have brought the whole subject with renewed emphasis before the minds of Biblical students of late, and its importance for the interpretation of the Old Testament and for the whole theology of revelation cannot be overestimated. Professor Lampe's essay is mainly concerned with the very necessary task of establishing some principle of control over the indiscriminate use of the typological method of interpretation of Scripture. He points out that one of the effects of modern historical criticism as applied to the literature of the Old Testament was to undermine the foundations upon which the typological method of interpretation rested as it was used by the early patristic writers. He asks whether typology can be employed "without a return to that conception of Scripture which essentially belongs to a pre-critical age".

Since the use of typology implies the unity of the Bible, Professor Lampe's first point is to establish the real nature of this unity. He rightly points out that "the primary sense in which the whole Bible is a unity is that the writers of every book contained in it are bound together at least by a common cultural inheritance", and he reminds us that the literature of the Bible represents a culture which is "determined by, and founded upon, historical experience". His second point is that Christ is the unifying centre of Biblical history, and that he deliberately fulfilled the various images presented by Biblical literature, bringing together different threads within it to form a consistent pattern. He goes on to say: "We can have no objection to a typology which seeks to discover and make explicit the real correspondences in historical events which have been brought about by the recurring rhythm of the divine activity."

To this sound view of a legitimate use of typology Professor Lampe opposes and rejects a form of typology which "rests, not on an interpretation of history, but on a particular quasi-Platonist doctrine of the relation of the literal sense of Scripture—the outward form or 'letter' of the sacred writings—to eternal spiritual reality concealed, as it were, beneath the literal sense". Such a form of typological exegesis is characteristic of Philo and the early Alexandrian Fathers. Here typology in the true sense is replaced by allegory, which, it is safe to say, is now completely discredited, even if St Paul on rare occasions used it. Professor Lampe regales us with some curious examples of the almost incredible lengths to which some of the Fathers carried this method of scriptural exegesis. He even includes Father Thornton in his censure, citing a particular instance from his contribution to *The Apostolic Ministry*; but, even if Father Thornton has occasionally carried his typological exegesis to somewhat daring lengths, it is clear from all his writings that no one could be more completely possessed of the true view of the unity of Scripture as grounded on historical experience of the divine activity; indeed, his special doctrine of the "organic" nature of revelation rests upon such a view. Nevertheless Professor Lampe's *caveat* is necessary and timely. Neo-fundamentalism is a subtle danger which, under the guise of devotion to Scripture, might easily rob us of the very real gains which have come to us through the right use of the methods of historical criticism applied to Biblical literature.

Mr Woollcombe's essay is by way of a learned footnote to Professor Lampe's text, and contains much useful and interesting material. His discussion of St Paul's use of allegory suggests that a clearer distinction between type and allegory is needed. For instance, he claims that St Paul's interpretation of the Passover in 1 Cor. 5. 6-8 is allegorical, whereas most commentators would regard it as typological; but, even granting that St Paul's use of allegory is more extensive than earlier authorities allow, one gladly assents to Mr Woollcombe's contention that his allegorism was firmly anchored to history, or what he would have regarded as history. The effect on one's mind after reading this useful and stimulating little book is that a renewed and exhaustive lexical study of the terms used is greatly to be desired. Perhaps it would be of no great loss if the word "type" fell into disuse, and that "symbol" or "image" came into use in its place, together with such a natural history of symbol as is now being so ably carried out by Professor Erwin Goodenough in his great work *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*.

S. H. Hooke

BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY

ATLAS OF THE BIBLE. By L. H. GROLLENBERG, O.P. Nelson. 70s.

THIS handsome volume appears in ecumenical and international guise. The work is by the famous Dutch scholar and archaeologist; the translation is by the English (and Manchester) scholars Miss Reid and Dr Rowley; the foreword is by the American Dr Albright and the preface is by another Dominican, the well-known director of archaeological studies at Jerusalem, Roland de Vaux. The result is what one would expect from the conjuncture of so many stars, a brilliant illumination of biblical studies.

The presentation is somewhat unusual. The many coloured maps carry notes on the historical events connected with the principal place names. Thus by simply looking at the maps one can follow the whole history of biblical times. Indeed this is a more immediately rewarding method than that of looking up places in the index. For the sake of clarity and simplicity in the maps the customary lines of latitude and longitude have been omitted. Although this certainly improves the appearance of the maps, it does make speedy reference a little difficult.

In addition to this method of making geography the foundation of the history there is also a very considerable history in a separate running text. As one would expect, this is specially strong on the archaeological side. Graphic as the narration is in itself, its vividness is further enhanced by more than four hundred photographs as illustrations to the text. The whole work forms a truly magnificent volume, reflecting great credit upon all who have been associated with its production, especially of course upon the distinguished author.

W.W.

THE BELOVED PHYSICIAN

THE LETTERS OF LUKE THE PHYSICIAN. By ROGER LLOYD. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

IT ALL depends what you are looking for. The adherents of the Christian religion of course want to know how their faith was launched upon the world, and the large collection of first-century documents emanating from the movement and soon gathered together under the name of the New Testament do not exactly answer the question. They may be interpreted in several ways and by different methods. Rackham's lucid *Commentary* attempts it one way, and Sir W. M. Ramsay's attractive writings on St Paul and Asia Minor another way. Yet still this extraordinary circle of the earliest Christians does not quite come alive. So a warm welcome must be accorded to Canon Lloyd's book *The Letters of*

Luke the Physician in which he aims at doing the same thing by the method of fiction.

He has composed a number of letters, thirty-four in all, in which Luke and Theophilus and Barnabas and other New Testament personages (but not Paul) write to one another, reporting, discussing, and questioning the new Way to which they are most of them committing themselves. One new personage, to whom Canon Lloyd has given the name of Issachar, also has a considerable share in the correspondence. The whole effect is certainly novel. It makes the reader feel more than ever before as though he were contemporary with the Apostolic Age. It makes the apostles and their fellow-workers seem almost contemporary with us. It offers a background to the extraordinary events which evidently underlie the ministry of St Paul, and also an insight into the psychology of Christian faith and discipleship. Canon Lloyd has got hold of a new idea, or rather several of them, but at the same time, while offering us a novelty, he is particularly careful to keep to what the New Testament does tell us and to amplify it only by what is probable. This he explains in an interesting Preface. There is but one *caveat* to be uttered. This will be a very useful book for teaching purposes, but, if the pupils are children, it will be important to make it clear to them that the letters are not genuine.

ADAM FOX

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By GEORGE S. HENDRY. S.C.M. 12s. 6d.

DR HENDRY, who is Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton, has written an excellent book; and not its least merit is its brevity. If more theologians remembered, as he has done, that life is more than reading books, particularly in an age when life is fuller and books are legion, we might be spared much unnecessary expenditure of time and patience. He aptly begins by pointing out that "it has become almost a convention that those who undertake to write about the Holy Spirit should begin by deploring the neglect of this doctrine in the thought and life of the Church to-day". This neglect he finds overestimated; for the whole field of Christian belief and experience is shot through and through with the presence of the Spirit. This doctrine is not perhaps the "Cinderella of theology" after all.

The author treats his subject in five closely but clearly written chapters, which were originally special lectures given at the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary. He first speaks of the Holy Spirit and Christ, and argues that in the New Testament the Spirit in fact means the Spirit of Christ. Any difference between, say, the Johannine

and Pauline conceptions of the Spirit are only "a difference of perspective". The two views are complementary: the Spirit continues the presence of Christ beyond the brief span of his historical appearance and completes it by effecting its inward apprehension among men. In both emphases, however, the Spirit is presented in a purely Christocentric reference. There is no reference in the New Testament to any work of the Spirit apart from Christ. The Spirit is, in an exclusive sense, the "Spirit of Christ". And he dismisses a naturalistic doctrine of the Spirit. "The New Testament contains no trace of the conception of the Spirit as the principle that animates the life of man as God's creature."

In the second chapter, "The Holy Spirit and God", although in one place, where he refers to "respective spheres of activity", he almost slips into modalism, Dr Hendry gives admirable comment on the place of the Spirit in the early Christian creeds. In particular he expounds the pros and cons of the *filioque* clause, making a special study of Barth's defence of it, but himself concludes that its introduction was "a false solution to a real problem". One is only too conscious in this sort of discussion how easy it has been—and still is—to get bogged down in theological language. We have always to remember that intellectual propositions are not themselves the truth of revelation, but are only devices—often poor ones—to enable us to adjust our spiritual sight.

The third chapter goes on to deal with the Holy Spirit and the Church. Here there is too much simplification, perhaps because of lack of space. It is unsatisfactory to contrast, as the author does, the Roman Catholic and Evangelical-Protestant understanding of the relation between the Spirit and the Church. Nevertheless, at the present time when the two traditions themselves are being thrown up in clearer contrast, some such statement is inevitable and, no doubt, necessary. It should be noted that Dr Hendry is not happy about the Anglo-Catholic view of the Spirit and the Church, as set forth in *The Apostolic Ministry*; and most Anglican Evangelicals would agree with him. Few Protestants will quarrel with the author's summing up on this point: "Thus, while Roman Catholicism interprets the Spirit as the soul of the Church and so blurs the distinction between Christ and the Church, Protestantism recognizes the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ, i.e., the Spirit in which Christ, remaining identical with himself, is present with his Church as Saviour and Lord." Indeed, he might have gone on to suggest that the Protestant view of the Spirit upholds the Christian revelation whereas the Roman Catholic can imply a kind of natural theological evolutionism.

The penultimate chapter gives an excellent survey of the rôle of the Spirit in connection with the Word, notably the Scriptures. The inspiration and authority of the Bible, as well as the formation of the canon, receive a careful treatment which concludes that "the testimony of the Spirit in the Word is registered, not in any properties of the Scriptural record, but where the Church receives the testimony of the Word and repeats it in the testimony of its own faith". Finally, in the chapter on the Holy Spirit and the Human Spirit, we find a balanced attempt to steer between a liberal naturalistic doctrine on the one hand

and the more extreme predestinarian teaching, as in Augustine and some of the modern neo-Calvinists, on the other.

Altogether this is a very good book, commendably concise and inexpensive, which will be welcomed by the clergy and by theological students. It is typical of the sound neo-Protestant theology which is beginning to revivify Christendom at the present time. One small point, however, occurs to the reviewer which is perhaps not without some significance. It is a pity that nowhere does Dr Hendry use the more numinous name "Holy Ghost". The fashion of always preferring "Holy Spirit" ought to pass. Modern theology often suffers for being so prosaic. The language of religion should be closer to that of poetry than that of the scientific treatise.

D. W. GUNDRY

SELECT DOCUMENTS

A NEW EUSEBIUS. By J. STEVENSON. S.P.C.K. 21s.

THE title is intriguing, but it must not be allowed to mislead. Eusebius wrote a famous history of the Church and one of his happiest traits as a historian was his habit of incorporating his sources in his text. This book gives us a collection of sources without the text, although the historical continuity is provided by short but invaluable notes on the selected passages. The book might perhaps more accurately have been called "A New Kidd" or even "A New Gwatkin", for its avowed purpose is to replace the volumes of sources provided by those scholars, with which several generations of students have been thoroughly familiar. That it will most efficiently fulfil its aim is quite certain.

The documents here supplied are illustrative of the history of the Church to A.D. 337, the date of the death of Constantine. It is hoped that a further volume will carry the story some centuries later. If it turns out to be as good as this, it will be very good indeed. One would find it difficult to imagine any better *vade mecum* to put into the hands of a student launching out upon the study of early church history, who wants to know what the leading characters had to say for themselves in their own words—and no student is worth his salt who does not possess that modicum of ambition. Even a veteran worker in the field may be glad to have this handy compilation by him.

Both alike will be further helped by some neat chronological tables in parallel columns, of which the last provides a list of contemporary pagan thinkers and writers. Altogether an excellent compilation.

W.W.

ST CYPRIAN

ST CYPRIAN: THE LAPSED AND THE UNITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. Translated and edited by MAURICE BEVENOT, S.J. (Ancient Christian Writers, Vol. XXV.) Longmans. 21s.

THE series "Ancient Christian Writers goes from strength to strength and the present volume is a most welcome addition. Few scholars are as well qualified as Fr Bévenot to undertake this particular task, for his work on the two recensions of the *de Unitate* is widely known and bids fair to become the most widely held theory on the subject.

The introduction to the two works is clear and good but is somewhat inadequate on the historical side. A more substantial account of the facts at this point would have filled out and illuminated the brief allusions to historical events in the notes on the text. An Anglican reviewer will hardly be expected to endorse the provoking statement that "Cyprian is a standing example of what we mean when we speak of the Papal Primacy being 'implicit' in the early Church". On the previous page it is correctly stated that "he had never said that the Pope possessed universal jurisdiction" and the notes to the text of the *de Unitate* frequently call attention to the fact that a technical Petrine primacy was not in his mind. To introduce the doctrine *implicite* on the tenuous ground "that he never denied it either" seems rather like getting out of a difficulty on a technicality. Both editor and reviewer can, however, agree that "he had not that long experience of life in the Church which alone would have enabled him to write of the Church . . . with that accuracy of touch which would have stood the test of time". This is proved by the experience of St Augustine who had the mortification of finding his Donatist opponents making their appeal to St Cyprian. Where, however, Fr Bévenot would try to induce us to advance beyond the "episcopalianism" of St Cyprian, others of us would question the truth of the maxim *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* without a much wider definition of the term "*ecclesia*" than St Cyprian could have envisaged. If practical modification of the full rigour of the Cyprianic position were introduced by St Augustine, lines of theological advance are suggested in an admirably succinct discussion of the subject by Canon Greenslade on pages 120-2 of his volume *Early Latin Theology* in the Library of Christian Classics.

The translations of both works read smoothly and naturally and the notes are particularly good in their discussion of the idiosyncrasies of Cyprianic style and vocabulary. Yet, while this is invaluable for the scholar, it may at times confuse the general reader who is working with the translation. The character of the Biblical text used by St Cyprian is carefully described in its place.

Few major difficulties are presented by the treatise on the Lapsed. Special attention is directed to the light shed by the work on the Penitential Discipline of the Church at this period. This is sensibly and even authoritatively handled in the light of recent discussion. But the note on the closing sentences of chapter 20 seems less than conclusive.

Surely the situation depicted in chapter 18 is too firmly drawn either to be treated as mere supposition or as cancelled out by the much vaguer statements of the later chapter. Is this *benignior interpretatio* really justified?

An editor of the *de Unitate* is faced with a much more difficult and complicated task, and here again Fr Bévenot does not fail. His fundamental solution of the existence of two recensions, both with a good claim to be considered Cyprianic so far as style is concerned, is to regard the Primacy text as the earlier, written while the author was, as it were, fighting the same battle back to back with the Church of Rome, and the Received Text as the later when a divergence of interests over the Baptismal question had begun to make itself felt. This has been widely accepted, though Canon Greenslade warns us that "the hypothesis of interpolation cannot be regarded as dead". But the difficulties of the expositor have not ended when he has propounded his theory on the textual problem. In detailed points of exegesis, Fr Bévenot rightly prefers to restrict the teaching of the treatise to the position of the bishop in his local Church and to find the only advance beyond this in the concept of an unanimity of bishops. This standard of exegesis is probably correct; at least the burden of proof lies upon those who maintain that St Cyprian looked further. The embodiment of this unanimity of bishops in the conciliar system of North Africa is a familiar fact of Church History. It is not without parallel in the modern Lambeth Conference. Fr Bévenot (though not in his judgement St Cyprian) would complete the picture by the explication of an allegedly implicit doctrine of the universal jurisdiction of the Papacy. Those who believe this extension of St Cyprian's meaning to be Scripturally dubious and explicable historically on quite other grounds, will prefer to travel the longer (but ultimately safer) road of reliance in patience and charity upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit vouchsafed to the whole Church.

H. E. W. Turner

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

The Early Christian Church. By Philip Carrington. (2 Vols.) Cambridge University Press. 52s. 6d. each.

It might well be thought that we had enough large-scale histories of the Early Church. Of an older generation there are Kidd, Duchesne, and Lietzmann, and, more recently (for those who read French), the relevant volumes of Fliche-Martin. But Archbishop Carrington has succeeded in producing a work which reads freshly, although the ground which he covers has often been traversed before.

The narrative is written simply and graphically with not a few touches of humour. It is a book backed by considerable learning, but it

wears its learning lightly and is seldom, if ever, dull. It can be safely commended to a wider public than the professional scholar.

The limits of the work are somewhat unusual. We have grown accustomed to expect a history of the Early Church to end either with the so-called Establishment of the Church by Constantine or with the Council of Chalcedon. But Dr Carrington covers in detail the first five Christian generations (reckoned for this purpose as approximately forty years) and passes rapidly over the period between Origen and Nicaea with the exception of an excellent discussion of Eusebius of Caesarea. Considerations of space apart, it is not at first sight easy to assign reasons for this choice, and the tapering off of the concluding chapters give some appearance of lack of proportion. One of the greatest difficulties in writing a work of this kind must be to select the most convenient framework for deploying the material. Generally speaking, Dr Carrington works in generations. This has its advantages in giving a general impression of chronology, but it has its disadvantages when it comes to trying to see the material in wider sweeps. If the broad pattern of development emerges plainly enough, the reader may have to look in several places to discern the intermediate stages. The chapters themselves are broken up by frequent sub-headings. This has the advantage of helping the reader to see at a glance where he is going next, but tends at times to spoil the continuity of the narrative. The method of treatment means that at times fairly closely related works of a single author such as Justin Martyr are dealt with in different places, whereas the evidence of the *Martyrologies*, which are fully handled, might with advantage have been more concentrated together.

The history of the Christian Church is only part of the world history of its period, and the author makes frequent and adequate reference to the secular history of the times, clarified by informative chronological tables. Nor can the history of Christianity be satisfactorily understood without some knowledge of the general ferment of religion and philosophy in which it grew up. Here again Archbishop Carrington does not fail us. The book opens with an account of the Hellenistic period from the time of Alexander the Great, with special reference to Judaism. The fortunes of the parent faith are traced from time to time even after the birth of the Christian Church and the relevant Rabbinic evidence is particularly well deployed. The main philosophical and religious figures and trends in the paganism of the period are vividly portrayed. We are never left with the impression that the Christian Church lived in a religious or intellectual vacuum.

The general outlook of the author can best be described as a learned critical conservatism. He explains in his introduction that he believes in trusting the primary documents as much as possible, and he will have nothing to do with ambitious reconstructions of Church History which are more concerned to prove a thesis than to sit down patiently before the facts. His researches into the early history of his own archdiocese have convinced him of the general reliability of oral tradition, and he champions (perhaps a shade too warmly at times) the claims of material

of this kind in the early history of the Church. Papias fares better at the hands of Archbishop Carrington than he perhaps deserves. A good illustration of the author's attitude may be found in his treatment of the dates and authorship of the New Testament Epistles. He would obviously like to accept an early date for James, though he is aware of the difficulties involved. The Captivity Epistles of St Paul are held to belong to the Roman Captivity and not to earlier imprisonments at Caesarea or Ephesus. The author gives full scope to the work of amanuenses and therefore finds no difficulty with the Pauline authorship of Ephesians or the traditional ascription of 1 Peter. His views on the Pastoral Epistles, or the authorship of the Johannine literature, would not commend themselves to the majority of scholars. His conservatism is, however, always a reasoned conservatism. He has on his side points of substance which he always makes clearly and well, but some will not find them altogether decisive.

Archbishop Carrington approaches Church History mainly through personalities and documents. Individual Church leaders are well and firmly delineated. Tatian emerges as a somewhat Byronic figure, Irenaeus as "the safe man" of the period! Rhoden is aptly described as the "bright young man with all the solutions". But was Callistus really the attractive figure that Dr Carrington imagines, and, granted that he comes right at the end of the period which is treated in considerable detail, does St Cyprian really get the attention which he deserves? Some names read rather strangely. Why Satornil rather than Satornilus and why do the forms Valentinus and Valentine alternate without explanation?

The work abounds in brilliant summaries of the principal literature of the period. Here the author's range is thoroughly catholic, for the Gnostic documents and the Apocryphal New Testament receive attention no less than the Apostolic Fathers, the Apologists, and the Martyrologies. The summaries themselves abound in fresh insights and in some cases they become independent interpretations. In this connection special mention may be made of the author's treatment of the canonical Apocalypse and the Shepherd of Hermas. He will, however, have nothing to do with the current view of the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians.

The author's views on the Primitive Christian Catechism and Calendar are (or should be) well-known. They are expounded in their place, but are not unduly obtruded. The aspects of Church life which they represent are, however, rightly brought to the fore. The early Church was not merely a self-organizing, theologizing body in an uneasy relationship to the secular power; it was first and foremost an evangelistic and liturgizing community.

There are certainly some points on which an alternative view can be maintained without discredit, and many on which one reader at least would have welcomed a fuller discussion than the scope of the work allowed. There are, however, many more in which familiar facts are given a new and fresh perspective. The author's own suggestions are

often made almost in an aside and would normally repay further consideration. His translation of the titles of some of Clement's works as "Youth Leader", "Equipment for the Road", and "Blueprints" linger in the mind.

The book has adequate bibliographies and an excellent index. The Cambridge University Press has produced a work which is a delight to handle with beautiful letterpress, informative maps, and abundant and well-chosen illustrations. The only material objection to the book is its long price. Those who can afford to purchase it, or induce their Libraries to add it to their shelves, will be amply repaid.

H. E. W. Turner

THE CELTIC MISSION

The Columban Church. By J. A. Duke. (2nd Ed.) Oliver & Boyd. 15s.

When *The Columban Church* first appeared its reviewer (*C.Q.R.*, October 1932) gave it but brief mention and faint praise. This new edition bears witness not only to the remarkable and increasing interest which has been taken in the Celtic Church during the last thirty years but also to the quality and value of Dr Duke's lucid account of the rise, flowering, and decline of the great Christian movement of the sixth and seventh centuries which is centred in the work of Columba at Iona.

In this attractively-printed and well-produced book the vigour and clarity of Dr Duke's style makes easy reading. The main body of the work is contained in four chapters: "Pre-Columban Christianity", "The Growth of the Columban Church", "The Decline of the Columban Church", and "Characteristics of the Columban Church". Nine appendixes on matters of historical importance and liturgical interest, together with numerous footnotes and a comprehensive list of authorities, provide ample material for stimulating the interest which Dr Duke awakens in the reader. He moves fearlessly into the much disputed question of the relative importance of the work of Ninian and Columba in the evangelization of the Northern Picts, and champions the cause of Columba against the thesis of A. B. Scott (*The Pictish Nation, Its People and Its Church*) and W. D. Simpson (*The Historical Saint Columba*). Dr Duke has devoted one whole appendix to an analysis and a somewhat devastating criticism of Simpson's arguments, showing how weak and inadequate are the evidences which he uses to claim for Ninian and Candida Casa much of the glory that usually—and rightly according to Duke—has been given to Columba and Iona. Dr Simpson, undaunted, reiterated his contentions, without however answering Duke's criticisms, in his later work *The Celtic Church in Scotland* (1935). It is to be regretted that the publishers in producing this new edition did not

include a new chapter to bring the late Dr Duke's work up to date by showing the relevance of scholarship since 1932. Much that has been done since then in the field of archeological research and in linguistics—particularly Professor Chadwick's *Early Scotland*—has considerable bearing on the matters discussed. A note on Celtic art and an expansion of the very brief mention of monuments would also have enhanced the value of this new edition. It is a pity that the second edition slavishly copies the old—even to the extent of repeating its errors. Whereas a Sassenach printer in 1932 might be forgiven for not knowing Oengus the Culdee, a Scottish printer in 1957 should have been able to avoid giving him two different spellings on one page (p. 155). Drostan suffers the same fate (p. 161), and Zephyrinus, Honoratus, and Brude also appear in strange guise. These however are but slight faults.

The Columban Church is not, and does not set out to be, a comprehensive study with carefully weighed scholarship, but rather is an attempt to cut away the briars of legend and the sods of ignorance and neglect, and to expose on the foundation of Adamnan and Bede a true picture of what the great Church of Columba was like in the time of its growth, its glory, and its decay. For all those, and they must be many, who want in short compass a good account of that virile and zealous movement of the Spirit thirteen centuries ago—a movement whose influence played and even yet plays a large part in shaping British Christianity—this is the book.

R. E. Turner

THOMAS BECKET

The Turbulent Priest. By Piers Compton. Staples Press Limited. 15s.

The life of Thomas Becket, so full of dramatic incident, lends itself to the theatrical and highly-coloured treatment it receives at the hands of his latest biographer. But it is doubtful if this uncritical and popular presentation is really appropriate to the subject, for it is well to remember that the character and personality of Becket, like that of the vast majority of medieval ecclesiastics, eludes us. "The most assiduous medievalist", writes Professor Knowles, "is often the first to admit that he can get no clear sight of the great archbishop." To make up for this ignorance of his real character and inner life Mr Piers Compton has had to rely on a vivid imagination and the lavish use of local colour. For this type of writing Becket is a gift. His ability, his energy, his extravagant magnificence made his chancellorship memorable, and with his hounds, his hawks, and his horses he was a dazzling figure. Then came the dramatic change in his behaviour when on Archbishop Theobald's

recommendation he was appointed his successor and Henry made his greatest mistake in passing over Gilbert Foliot, the natural candidate for the primacy. From now onwards the story is well known. Becket becomes more papal than the Pope and utterly repudiates the royal authority. He took his great decisions with ruthless energy and few could defend the Vézelay excommunications, the first excommunication of John of Salisbury, and four years later the sentence against York and London. To pass judgement is very difficult. Both King and Archbishop had right on their side, but it would have been better if Mr Compton had remembered that it is Henry's great legal reforms, not his quarrel with the Church or his vast continental dominions, that made Henry's reign of such supreme importance, and that not even the six-year-long quarrel with Becket interrupted the steady assertion of the *Rule of Law*; though the tragic end of the Archbishop, which horrified Christendom, robbed the King of the fruits of one of his greatest works. On the other hand, the cause for which Becket suffered martyrdom cannot in fairness be dismissed as that of clerical separatism, but was inspired by the principle that the law of the Church of England could not be set aside at the dictates of the royal will. This tension is still unsolved and the quarrel of Becket and Henry takes its place in the long record of conflict between Church and State. As usual the result was a compromise.

Those who maintain that the Pope and the Church were always right and the Emperor and the King always wrong will no doubt find little fault with this sustained eulogy of Mr Compton's. But even they will find so many purple patches tedious and will want to hear the other side.

As an illustration, of both the style and the point of view of Mr Compton, part of his last words may be quoted:

> For it might be said that the blood of Becket, seeping over the cathedral stones, found its way into the royal tapestry; a stain that spread until the very background, on which the figures reposed, was worn and rotted, leaving the figures themselves to undergo moral weakening and a final catastrophe. It spread to Richard II, done to death in the gloom of Pontefract castle; to Richard III, killed by treason at Bosworth; to Charles I, struck down by legists and moneylenders on a public platform at Whitehall; and lastly to James II who was forced, by a clique of merchants, to surrender his throne to a Prince of the House of Orange.

In contrast to this kind of thing, as a model of historical writing and impartiality, Professor David Knowles' Raleigh Lecture on Becket may be recommended. The reader should also look up the references to Becket in Dr Austin Poole's volume in *The Oxford History of England*, and if he desires to hear the case for the King he can re-read with enjoyment "Life and Times of Thomas Becket" in the fourth volume of J. A. Froude's *Short Studies on Great Subjects*.

A. F. JUDD

REFORMATION THEOLOGY

KINGDOM AND CHURCH: A STUDY IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE REFORMATION. By T. F. TORRANCE. Oliver and Boyd. 16s.

THE relationship between the concepts of the Kingdom of God and the Church, whilst still remaining a central problem of ecclesiology, has been profoundly transformed in theological treatment since the beginning of the century by the recovery of a sense of eschatology. This has not only benefited current theology, by eliminating the sterile conflict (as it is now seen to be) between individualistic and institutional Christianity, in terms of which the Liberal Age saw the question. It has made possible a better understanding of historic ecclesiologies, which could only be misunderstood if regarded in this light. Of this fact Professor Torrance's valuable book is one example. It is doubtful whether anyone writing in the period before the first World War could have understood so clearly the differing views of sixteenth-century Reformers about the relations of Church and Kingdom, which is the theme of this study, or could have seen so well their outlook upon the place of the Church in the world.

After an introductory chapter, our author divides his work into three parts, dealing respectively with Luther, Bucer, and Calvin. (It may be said at this point that one misses here a chapter on Zwingli, that figure who is so easily overlooked, and is yet so indispensable in the understanding of the Reformation.) He designates the views of his three protagonists as the eschatologies respectively of faith, love, and hope, a categorization which is maintained with consistency and which well fits the facts. Luther's insistence upon the hiddenness of the true Kingdom of God, securely anchored in the believer's heart as the *Reich der Gnade*, in contrast to the *Reich der Tat* in which he is forced to live, is pre-eminently a doctrine of faith. Bucer, as Professor Torrance shows us, is no less insistent upon Christian love as the characteristic of the Church and the foretaste of the Kingdom. Calvin sees the Kingdom as already present in embryo in the Church and as pointing our expectations forward to the final consummation of the work of grace.

One cannot but admire the wealth of quotation and the exactitude of scholarship with which the argument is developed, in a theme which could easily lead an enthusiast to sacrifice fact to predetermined theory. Professor Torrance, it seems to us, has saturated himself in the thought of the Reformers and escapes the danger of reading into them what is not there. The historian may regret that the thesis is not worked out into an explanation of how the three types of Reformation eschatology influenced the political outlook of different types of Protestantism, but all books have a necessary limit. Anyone familiar with sixteenth-century political attitudes can make the application himself and will be grateful to the author for the material so ably supplied to him.

A word of criticism seems demanded by the introductory chapter, which reveals some unfamiliarity upon Professor Torrance's part with

medieval thought. To assert without qualification that pre-Reformation thinking regarded nature as "changeless and even eternal" (p. 1) is to shut one's eyes to more than one aspect of scholasticism. It is perhaps noteworthy that, to judge by references, our author is dependent in this chapter upon lesser, and less well known, lights than the acknowledged authorities upon medieval thought. This leads him both to a contrast between medieval and Reformation eschatology as respectively static and dynamic, which the facts do not justify, and also to an unguarded assertion that "modern empirical science" had to wait for the period of the Reformation for a recognition of contingency in nature (p. 2). If the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are included in the pre-Reformation period this is quite certainly untrue, as so much recent work upon the history of science demonstrates, nor is it even completely true if they are excluded. Occamism was one important factor in the development of empirical science, and the earlier types of medieval philosophy were not so inimical to *a posteriori* thought as used to be supposed.

With this reservation one can have little but praise for the book, which is a very welcome addition to Reformation studies.

THOMAS M. PARKER

WESLEYS' LANGUAGE

THE WESLEYS AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By G. H. VALLINS. Epworth. 8s. 6d.

THIS little book consists of four essays on John Wesley's Grammar, his Dictionary, the Syntax of his Journal, and the Language, Metre, and Rhyme of Charles Wesley's Hymns. It is a book rather for the expert in the science and history of grammar, and not for the general reader. John Wesley wrote a short Grammar for the children in Kingswood School, Bristol. He also wrote a short Dictionary for the use of his local preachers. Obviously these themes have little appeal save to the expert or perhaps to the antiquary interested in the beginnings of Wesleyan history. The last essay on Charles Wesley's hymns is more readable, but much of that is devoted to an analysis of the metre and rhyme of hymns. However, the general reader may be interested in one or two points. The meanings of words have changed in several instances since the eighteenth century. For example, "enthusiasm", "justification", "balderdash", "museum", and so on. Some of John Wesley's definitions are quaintly amusing: a Rural Dean is "a Clergyman appointed to observe the behaviour of other Clergymen"; Deism is "infidelity denying the Bible"; organ "an instrument: so the eye is the organ of sight", without any reference to music. Of course there were differences in

spelling, though under the influence of the dictionaries of Johnson, Bailey, and others, English orthography was becoming standardized. One eighteenth century form has survived to modern times: in Bishop Hensley Henson's writings we read "Catholick", fanatick", bishoprick".

A. J. Macdonald

DIVINE WRATH

The Wrath of the Lamb. By Anthony Tyrrell Hanson. S.P.C.K. 25s.

It is the business of a reviewer to assess value first, and criticize faults next. This book is a valuable study of Divine wrath, and traces its gradual transformation from the royal irascibility of the God of the early Old Testament material, through the near-Deism of the later material, to the fully developed Christian doctrine. If we cannot accept without qualification the implied claim that in the last hundred years all thinkers misunderstood God's wrath until Dr Hanson wrote his book, we must still see in his book much to admire. He has covered the ground with amazing thoroughness, and he provokes his reader—often into a train of thought—often into unseemly irritation. But before beginning any detailed criticism, I would repeat, this is a really worth-while book.

It is also a book to disagree with heartily from time to time. Dr Hanson's general conclusion is that the wrath of God is an impersonal business, a process growing in the law—sin—wrath sequence; God does not show anger, and if Christ (who is the Image of God) seems to do so in St Mark, Dr Hanson will not let us argue from that that God is ever angry. But surely it is too simple an escape from the implications of the Incarnation to say that "what corresponds to Jesus being angry is indeed the wrath of God, the arrangements which God has made whereby sin brings its own consequences . . ." (p. 114). When Jesus was angry, the result was a cleansing, a blessing of children, a healing, a temple reform. What is wrong with human anger is not the feeling but its expression; and if we see anger in the image of God in Christ—but anger working redemption—are we to deny it to the very Godhead himself? If so, we are dangerously near to Marcion. One can only agree with P. T. Forsyth, that God cannot be personal in his love and impersonal in his wrath. The love and the wrath are the "Yang" and the "Yin" which make up the world process of Chinese philosophy, made personal in a Christ who revealed God's personality and in whom all processes are summed up. But though Dr Hanson is, I believe, wrong in thinking that by impersonalizing God's wrath he is somehow un-blotting the copy-book, his final exposition of the wrath in the Apocalypse is first rate.

Some of his argument is unbalanced. He makes much of the Chronicler's dislike of attributing wrath to God, and supports it with

detailed references. But the Chronicler disliked attributing any feeling to God; and exactly the same case could be made for "love" or "mercy", which in these books is only attributed to God in quotations from other sources (including Nehemiah's prayer formula).

It is the modern fashion to quote too many authorities: good argument should stand on its own feet. Dr Hanson follows this fashion, and often sets right what he believes to be their errors and misunderstandings. Even the giants do not escape (St Paul, p. 78; Sanday and Headlam, p. 89; Westcott, pp. 140, 142), and one reader at least felt that sometimes it was Dr Hanson who failed to understand *them*. One instance of this is from p. 77: in 1 Cor. 10. 22 Paul is not suggesting that the Lord can be provoked to jealousy; he is scouting the very idea, as is shewn by the use of *mé* (expecting the answer No) to introduce the second half of the verse. None the less, much of the exegesis in this book is suddenly enlightening in dark places (e.g. of Rom. 9. 22 on pp. 90f.), and there are useful summaries of word meanings. These relieve the rather arid discussions of time and tense which from time to time attempt to distinguish the immediate from the eschatological—a distinction which was less real to the early Church than it seems to us.

Misprints need correction on pages 22, 40, 57, 84, 115, 133, 139 (two), 142, 145, 159, 182, 185. The Zadokite reference on p. 49 is not correct for Gaster's *Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*, which most of us have; it will be found on p. 80 of that translation (c. viii). With its faults, this is a "big" book in the best sense, and well worth careful study.

H. A. Blair

DIVERSE APPROACH

Firmly I Believe. By Thomas Veitch. Skeffington. 7s. 6d.

The Day Christ Died. By Jim Bishop. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 21s.

These two books display a vivid contrast in their method of approaching their subject. *Firmly I Believe* is a fair title for the first. The author obviously does; and when he states his Christian beliefs simply and forcefully in the latter part of the book I believe he would help many.

But I doubt if the sort of person whom he expects to give time and thought to his latter chapters would get through the earlier ones. For although nobody minds having their own and other people's misconceptions shown up, criticized, or even ridiculed, it must never be done in such a way as to give the impression that the views stated could only be held by a moron!

In his attempt to expose the weakness of various popular heresies the earlier chapters are full of "Let us turn now to those without the Church and have a belt at them." The reader is left with the feeling that in his

desire to be militant Mr Veitch has not been fair and talks down to his audience.

The book gains nothing from the heavy sarcasm of that well-worn theme "speaking as a sinister priest of this deplorable organization" or "speaking as one of the sheltered, innocent parsons". And surely any chaplain who could write: "I was also chaplain to the R.A.F., an officiating chaplain with no uniform and no rank, which is far better for the man and also for the chaplain, because not being in uniform he can treat the commanding officer merely as a tiresome layman, and that worthy can't do a thing about it . . ." shows an astonishing lack of imagination for what the co-operation of the Commanding Officer can mean for the unit, the Chaplain, and the Church.

So if you buy this book, begin at chapter 5, "Bringing in God", and when you've finished go back to chapters 1-4.

In *The Day Christ Died* Jim Bishop has caught the reader's interest from the beginning. He claims: "It is, I hope, a practical approach to the events of the day, a journalist-historian's approach rather than a theologian's. I wanted to see Jesus, the man, during this time when he chose to suffer as a man." His book justifies his claim and the reader sees Jesus as a man. The language is simple and direct. Although the story is an hour by hour account of the day of crucifixion beginning at 6 p.m. the night before, there are three chapters interspersed under the heading of "background". The first, that of the Jewish world; the third, that of the Roman world; and the second, a summary of Christ's own life and teaching. I found that these chapters, coming in the place they did, so far from holding up the narrative of the day he died heightened the tension of the story. It was as though during the intervals between the acts of an absorbing play the audience were given new facts and new light on the main characters. Thus more eagerly and more intelligently they wait for the next act.

I should like to put this book into the hands of many people. (That is why I regret it is so costly at 21s.) I should like to give it as a confirmation present to any intelligent young man or girl. And let it be remembered that although the book does enable the reader to see Jesus as a man there will be few who are not led by this book to see again the Son of God.

GEORGE REINDORP

CATHEDRAL HISTORY

CHICHESTER CATHEDRAL: ITS HISTORY AND ART. By W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

VERGERS, Canons, Deans, and others to whom falls the task of shepherding parties of young school-children round ancient cathedrals find it, generally speaking, an unrewarding task—on both sides. On the

few occasions when the children exhibit an interest, it is usually discovered that the teachers have prepared them beforehand for what they will see. But how is the teacher to be prepared for this work? The normal cathedral guide-book has usually been written only in order to interest the comparatively small public which has already some architectural knowledge, and is inadequate for a teacher who wants to prepare his class to see the cathedral whole. Dr Lowther Clarke provides the right kind of book for this teacher, though its excellencies will secure for it a much wider public. Of its 107 pages, only ten deal with architecture proper. The next sixty deal with history, and show how the changes and chances of local and national events and movements have made their impact on the life and work in and around the cathedral. After that come 100 pages describing the "art" of the cathedral, and its background, under such headings as Sculpture, Painting, Stained Glass, and so on. This section has three pages on Lettering, surely an almost unique feature in a cathedral guide, as well as excellent passages on Embroidery, Music, and Heraldry.

Archbishop Lang, in a letter to the late Dean, Arthur Duncan-Jones, once referred to "your seductive little cathedral", and the Art section of this little book will help people to understand something of what gives the cathedral that attractive charm to which Dr Lang referred.

The booklet is delightful to peruse, and the reader will be continually pleased with the shrewd and unexpected comments which come from the well-stored mind of the author. There is an absence of complacent dogmatism, and everywhere there is evidence of wide reading and patient research, distilled into the brief and simple observations which make the book on the whole so admirable for its declared purpose. This is not to say that there are not occasions on which the author perhaps takes for granted too much knowledge in his public, but, if a fault, it is well on the right side.

It is intriguing to learn that the formidable name of Bernhardi, to whom for so long so much of the paintings in the cathedral have been attributed, is merely an Italianization of plain Mr Barnard (and son) of Chichester, a local man who had a full-time post in the cathedral; it is salutary likewise to be reminded that the renowned Saxon sculptures (which are said to have influenced the style of Eric Gill) are "actually more 'modern' than the meaningless cenotaph of Dean Hook (d. 1875) nearby".

Some will think the illustrations are the least satisfactory part of the book. Those that roughly illustrate some feature of the cathedral serve their purpose well enough, but others are faulty in their detail, and tend to give the book a "Ye olde" atmosphere which it does not deserve.

✠ Colin Dunlop

ACTS OF WORSHIP

A Book of Worship for Schools. Compiled by H. F. Mathews. Epworth. 12s. 6d.

The aim of this book is clearly stated at the beginning of the preface, when it refers to "many excellent collections of prayers", "a number of useful lectionaries", and "several standard hymnals" in use at the present time. It is not the compiler's intention to add to these publications but, rather, to select and to collate existing material into a number of schemes for the daily Act of Assembly Worship in a Secondary School. There are a hundred and three of these schemes, each one based upon a central theme and grouped together to provide some kind of pattern from day to day.

The book, therefore, makes no claim to originality, but shows itself to be eminently practical. Its positive value lies

1. In the concise form of the Acts of daily Worship.
2. In the provision of choice between various alternatives which are provided.
3. In the encouragement which is given to the children themselves to take a full and significant part in the Act of Worship.

We wish that the compiler had added a note on the value of a short period of liturgical silence within the structure of the day's worship. He would probably reply that he leaves such an item, together with the use of visual-aids and appropriate music to the discretion and judgement of the conductor of the worship. We hope that the assumption that such accompaniments will naturally be supplied is not misplaced.

It is also a pity that in a Commemoration of those who have dedicated their lives to the service of God or of their fellow-men, no mention is made of those Saints whose names have been associated with the worship of both the Eastern and the Western Church from Apostolic times onwards.

F. A. Poulden

RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES

A Directory of the Religious Life. Issued by the Advisory Council for Religious Communities. 2nd Ed. 8s. 6d.

This new edition of the Directory calls for some comment and much thankfulness. Only too many in England to-day are still unaware of the revival of the Religious Life in the Anglican Communion; very few are aware of its extent and importance. A mere glance at the Directory would help anyone to realize the richness of the blessings God Almighty has been granting more and more since he called the first courageous

pioneers just over a century ago and established and increased their work a hundredfold. Every true vocation to the Religious life is a "miracle"—a call from God himself. That basic fact should be clear to anyone who seeks aright to consider the matters contained in this Directory. The only true way to consider the development of the Communities of men and women since the Oxford revival is with awe and thankfulness to Almighty God, without whose call and continued blessings not one, could have even come into being. In considering them we are indeed "on holy ground".

The early pioneering days in the teeth of prejudice, opposition, and even persecution were inevitably days of experiment, to some extent "trial and error". The experience of the years, and greater study and knowledge of the Life in both the Eastern and the Western Church, now afford rich fruits for those alive to-day. It is this that the Advisory Council has made available.

Some may even have to ask, What is this Advisory Council? "It is the *official* body of the Church of England for dealing with matters which concern the Religious Life and the relation between Bishops and Communities. The Chairman must be one of the Diocesan Bishops of the Province of Canterbury or of York, and is appointed by the two Archbishops. The Bishops of the two Provinces appoint six members to the Council, and the Communities also elect six members" (p. ix). The value of such a body will at once be obvious. It has no coercive powers. It advises on matters referred to it either by the Bishops or by the Communities. Its help is being continually sought. To the late Bishop Kenneth Kirk of Oxford the Council, and through it the Church at large, are deeply indebted. "It is mainly due to his knowledge, wisdom, clarity of mind, meticulous care for detail, and unflagging energy that the essential objectives of the Council have been already so nearly attained. . . . The stability and authority it has attained are due to the far-sighted vision and practical wisdom of Dr Kirk" (p. x).

The growth of our Communities and their gradual winning of recognition and appreciation from authority is reviewed in the Introduction. The Lambeth Conference of 1897 considered the subject of Religious Communities in a spirit of sympathetic appreciation. Thanksgiving was expressed to God for "the manifold tokens of His Blessing upon the revival of Religious Communities in our branch of the Catholic Church". The Committee concerned, in its report, expressed its desire to secure to Communities the duly regulated freedom that is essential to their life, and alluded to four essential points: (1) Vows; (2) The position of priests religious and of priests ministering to Religious; (3) Episcopal visitation; (4) Property. After later consultation with the heads of the more important Communities the Archbishop of Canterbury circulated a report to the English Episcopate in 1902, and after the Lambeth Conference of 1908 to every bishop of the Anglican Communion.

Their Graces, the present Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in commending this new edition of the Directory write: "The Vocation to

the service of God in Communities under the threefold Vows of Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience is an energy of the Holy Spirit which a Directory of this kind can never properly describe. Yet it is our hope that the Directory will assist in the understanding of this Vocation and in its orderly development within the life of the Church of England. To this end we commend it, and pray that it may serve God's glory."

T. L. MANSON, S.S.J.E.

EVANGELICAL LEADER

THOMAS HAWEIS, 1734-1820. By ARTHUR SKEVINGTON WOOD. S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society. 50s.

COMPLETING his diary for 19 November 1761 James Woodforde wrote: "Went this evening to Haw's (a famous Methodist) Lecture in St Giles' Church . . . very stupid, low, and bad stuff." The comment of an Oxford undergraduate would not be of great moment, did it not reflect the general attitude in his day towards clergy known as "Evangelicals". Of those, Thomas Haweis has not only lacked a biographer, but, for some reason, has been given but little space in the histories of the Evangelical Revival.

This gap has been admirably filled through the labours of Dr Skevington Wood. Some idea of the nature of his task may be gathered from the fact that, in addition to perusing the thirty-six publications of Haweis, he has worked through a collection of hitherto unpublished manuscripts now housed in the Mitchell Library, Sydney. These include an Autobiography covering the years 1734-96, and a supplementary Diary for 1791-1818, as well as numerous autograph letters, papers, and notes.

Born in the Cornish town of Redruth, Thomas Haweis might have had a medical career, if it had not been for Samuel Walker, curate of St Mary's, Truro, through whose Evangelical ministry he was both converted and led to seek ordination. To say that the achievement of the latter ambition was by no means easy for a man of Haweis' churchmanship is an understatement. In fact deliberate opposition was put in his way, and when, eventually, he was ordained, the troubles in his first curacy at St Mary Magdalene, Oxford, ended only with Bishop Hume's securing his removal. After spending a couple of years as Assistant Chaplain to the Lock Hospital, London, Haweis was offered the living of Aldwincle in Northamptonshire, where he remained Rector for the remaining fifty-seven years of his life, although the last eleven of them were spent in retirement at Bath.

Haweis also acted as a chaplain to Selina, Countess of Huntingdon. Unlike many of his Evangelical brethren, he did not feel it necessary to relinquish his allegiance to her after she had broken with the Church of

England; and thus, while remaining a devoted priest of the established Church, he could still take part in itinerant preaching for her ladyship. It is this aspect of his career which illustrates, as Dr Skevington Wood points out, the complex relationship existing between Evangelicalism and Methodism in eighteenth-century England.

Thomas Haweis' distinctive contribution may perhaps, be conveniently assessed under the headings of (*a*) hymnody, (*b*) missionary endeavours, and (*c*) theological writings. Regarding the first, his own words bear testimony to the low standard of worship in his day: "In our public worship the voice of joy and gladness is too commonly silent, unless in that shameful mode of psalmody, now almost confined to the wretched solo of a parish clerk, or to a few persons huddled together in one corner of the Church, who sing to the praise and glory of themselves, for the entertainment, or oftener for the weariness of the rest of the congregation."

He therefore gladly associated himself with the introduction of hymn-singing at the Lock Chapel, while later on, as Rector of Aldwincle, he produced a collection of hymns under the title of *Carmina Christo*. A few of these are still in use, and his well-known tune "Richmond" has been described as "of superlative merit". In truly Evangelical fashion, he laboured unceasingly, and despite disappointments, to promote the cause of overseas' missions, being himself the originator of the South Sea Mission, as well as a co-founder of the London Missionary Society. In the realm of scholarship he had the least success—his major theological writings were a *Biblical Commentary*, a translation of the New Testament, and *An Impartial and Succinct History of the Rise, Declension, and Revival of the Church of Christ*, which certainly cannot be described as "impartial"!

Dr Skevington Wood's biography which brings to light all this, and much more regarding this interesting but much-neglected figure, is undoubtedly an important contribution to the literature of the Evangelical Movement in general. The book is illustrated, and there are bibliographies of manuscript and published sources. Some slight errors occur here and there in the footnotes and index.

GORDON HUELIN

SMALL CHANGE

People You Meet. By Bryan S. Breed and others. Illus. by Hunk. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

Receiving the Sunday Gospel. By Patrick Cowley. Faith Press. 3s. 6d.

Why Do We Teach Christianity? By O. Jessie Lace. Foreword by the Bishop of Peterborough. National Society and S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

A student for the ministry is often encouraged to concentrate on large books and leave the small alone. This, on the whole, is good advice; and fortunate is the priest who has acquired a habit of study which enables him always to have some fairly weighty volume "on the go", which will test the assumptions of his thinking and prevent its becoming superficial. Yet in parish work he may find himself immersed in a population which hardly reads books at all and whose newspapers appear designed for illiterates. How can he begin to communicate the Christian message to them? Where can he find help? Is there not, perhaps, something to be said for small books after all—if only his people can be persuaded to read them?

The three small books before us have all something to be said for them. *People you Meet* may help him to prepare the members of his youth fellowship to meet criticism of Christian faith and practice at work or in the upper forms of schools. Clergy are sometimes told that they should give young people answers to the questions they will meet. This is always more easily said than done. The questions tend to be different from what had been anticipated. The value of this light-hearted but serious booklet is that it takes a series of subjects—human nature, progress, happiness, gambling, war, free will, etc.—and indicates common lines of criticism, then sets out points to be remembered *before a reply is given*. This is a sensible way of approach, which will prove serviceable to many.

Receiving the Sunday Gospel is not every one's book. But some will find it stimulating; and useful in bringing the Sunday Gospels alive for others. Here, Sunday by Sunday, the author speaks to his Lord about the message of the Gospel for the day. These are meditations in lively and contemporary language. To sense their quality the whole of one would need to be quoted. This is the opening paragraph on the Gospel for the Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity:

> Lord, it's when You talk about humility that You touch us on the raw. We are strangers to humility. There's a strong tendency to superiority and publicity in us, and that is why we are so critical of others and so quick to take offence when we are criticized. We want the limelight and praise for ourselves, and we take offence when others receive them and so overshadow us. What in our pride we want for ourselves and cannot have, we refuse to allow to others.

These chapters were written Sunday by Sunday; and that is how they should be read.

Why Do we Teach Christianity? is a production of a different kind. In fifty-five pages it has the quality to be expected in far larger volumes. Available at half-a-crown, it might be used in a discussion group with teachers. Its background is the 1944 Education Act, which not only made religious teaching a statutory obligation but recognized that no mere historical teaching of the facts of Christianity was sufficient by insisting also that there should be worship in the schools. The implications of this, for the teacher and for the community, are very great, and have by no means yet been fully realized. Teachers in the State schools bear a heavy responsibility in this matter. This book recognizes this responsibility, and gives indication of how it may be met. It deserves to be widely read.

H. G. G. Herklots

HOMILETICS

How Shall They Hear? By Gordon W. Ireson. S.P.C.K. 9s. 6d.

This excellent book on preaching should prove as valuable to the learner in laying true foundations as to the more experienced in recalling him to a renewed directness and relevance, when in course of time his sermons have become overburdened, or lacking in clarity and form.

The author has had a wide experience in speaking to clergy (especially the younger clergy) on the subject of preaching, and he tells us that all the extra attention now given to preaching and teaching in theological colleges does not always seem to bear fruit in a thorough grasp of first principles. His book, therefore, in its first part deals with these principles, and in the second part gives a dozen examples of sermons in which the principles are active.

After defining the preacher's purpose as that of communicating truth so that it may be received, loved, and followed, Canon Ireson devotes four chapters to the three root principles—preparing the mind to receive the truth; presenting the truth so that it can be assimilated; and applying it to daily life. Specially helpful here is his representation of the opening of the sermon as a party where the preacher is the host, wanting his guests to be at home, and taking pains to see that they recognize some familiar faces.

The first part of the book, which also contains chapters on Preaching and the Bible, and the Liturgical Sermon, is marked throughout by the enthusiasm of one who enjoys his craft, and by the always relevant, practical advice of one who has been in close touch with the needs of the parish priest. We may notice, for instance, that when Canon Ireson insists on planned preaching he points out (what is so often missed) that such preaching gives the clergy greater freedom. It not only ensures that they cover the ground adequately, but it relieves them of the constant worry of what to preach about next.

The twelve sermons in the second half of the book vary somewhat in quality—one or two, "Treasures in Heaven" and "The Ten Commandments", are outstanding: but through all of them we never cease to admire the technical resource and the warm humanity. There is a challenge delivered with the whole personality of the preacher to the whole personality of the hearer, with every encouragement to respond. This indeed is the method of Christ himself, and it is a strange thing that this book, like nearly all the great and good books on preaching, has no chapter on Christ's preaching and teaching. Such a chapter would add enormously to the authority of this book, as its usefulness would be increased by the addition of an index and a bibliography.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

PASTORAL SERMONS

FAITHFUL SAYINGS. By C. R. B. SHAPLAND. Epworth. 8s. 6d.

THE Reverend C. R. B. Shapland died in March 1952 and *Faithful Sayings* is a fitting tribute to his brilliant ministry which came to an all too sudden termination in its twenty-second year.

The sixteen sermons which this small book of ninety-five pages contains appear to have been preserved by his friends, and because of their length must be a curtailment of his actual utterances. For this very reason they will be found invaluable by any tired preacher seeking inspiration and new ideas—for the sermons as they stand are a challenge for expansion.

Despite his erudition there is no self-conscious display of learning, his style is simple and precise, there is no appeal to the emotions other than a direct statement of Christian truth, of which the chief quality is sincerity.

The originality of his mind is indicated by such titles of his sermons as: "It can Never be Worse than this", "Where the Rules Break Down", "The Secrets of Endurance", and "The Unwisdom of being Indispensable"; but above all, these short but suggestive sermons reveal the quality of the preacher himself. Having read them one feels in accord with the preface which says: "His friends recognised in him one of those choice spirits who, without accompaniment of drums and trumpets are used by God to demonstrate to His more earthly servants how His work may be well and truly done."

CLARENCE MAY

PAPUAN ADVENTURE

PRISONER'S BASE AND HOME AGAIN. By JAMES BENSON. Robert Hale. 15s.

THIS "charming and intensively moving book", as Bishop Wand calls it in the foreword, needs to be read against the background of recent New Guinea history. Before the year 1871, when the London Missionary Society opened the drama of missionary work in this large island, the primitive inhabitants were living their isolated life amidst the tangle of jungle-covered mountains and valleys unheeded by the outside world. The character of the country and the climate were their protection. But in the eighteen-eighties, when the leading countries of Europe were dividing up the undeveloped regions in Africa and the South Pacific into spheres of influence, New Guinea fell to the lot of Holland, Germany, and Great Britain. Port Moresby was occupied in 1884 and Papua was transferred to Australia some years later. The German portion of the island was occupied by Australian Troops during the first world war and became the mandated territory of New Guinea, administered by Australia separately from Papua. The natives were protected from exploitation and a very happy co-operation existed between government and missions for their benefit.

It may be questioned whether any child race has ever been more severely tested than were the recently converted Christians on the coasts of New Guinea by the sudden irruption of the Japanese forces upon their island in 1942. Port Moresby was the enemy's goal. That in their hands, Australia would be within their grasp. Their strategy was to attack by sea and land. The former was frustrated by the American naval victory in the Coral Sea. The plan by land was to cross the Owen Stanley Range and take it from the rear.

It is at this point that Father Benson's story opens. He was living an ideal life on the mission station at Gona. That was "Home" to him. On 21 July 1942 he fled into the bush with two lady missionaries, Sister May Hayman and Miss Mavis Parkinson, both of whom fell into Japanese hands and were murdered. Benson had become separated from them and escaped. He never ceased to inquire about them during his captivity, whenever he got the chance, and their fate was, perhaps, his greatest sorrow. He returned to Gona on 23 August 1946, resolved to dedicate the rest of his life to the cause for which he had come to New Guinea. What happened to him during those four years from 1942 to 1946 is the subject of his book.

His experiences roughly divide themselves into three periods, his flight and surrender to the Japanese, his imprisonment at Rabaul introduced by his guard thus. "Benson! today-you-me-go-ah-Rabaul. Okay?" "Okay", I said. "You-take-u-one booku-and-one forku. You-come back? No!" "All Right", I said. "When do we leave?" The third period brought him peace of mind, but no security of body, for the bombs from both the enemy and allies descended upon the company of Roman mission-

aries with whom he was lodging, as the Australian and American forces were slowly driving the Japanese from Rabaul northward until they left New Guinea.

There is only one way to catch the atmosphere of this book, that is, to read it. It is in the first place the story of a courageous man, whose disciplined life and simple faith enabled him to survive where others would have perished—of a very human saint, who, plunged into a state of physical misery, could preserve his sanity and humour, could maintain the power and dignity of his priesthood, and could help those of either side in the battle, who came within his orbit. It would be a gain to missionary history if some competent person were to undertake a record of Father Benson's whole life before the facts are forgotten. But the widest appeal of the book will come from the intimate knowledge that it reveals of the Japanese. The author lived with them for four years and accurately observed all types. Without prejudice he appraises the good and the bad.

It is not however simply as a record of the past but as a pointer to the future that the book should be read. Many years ago Bishop Philip Strong raised the slogan "New Guinea for Christ". The Christian missions and the government of Australia have the joint responsibility of working hand in hand for the wise upbringing of these child races. Much has been done since the war. Air travel is making it possible to reach the tribes of the interior. There is nothing now to prevent the Bishop's slogan from coming true, "New Guinea for Christ".

J. W. S. Tomlin

FLIGHT FROM LIFE

The Urge to Mass Destruction. By Samuel J. Warner. Grune and Stratton. 25s.

The title of this book might lead one to suppose that it is concerned with the interesting psycho-pathology of those who wilfully misinterpret the last part of Article XXXI, but alas! it is not so. The author, an American psycho-therapist, is concerned with the phenomena, often found in patients undergoing psycho-analysis, whereby destructive forces are unleashed. It is the experience of psycho-analysts, i.e. those who practise Freudian techniques, that there comes a negative therapeutic reaction whereby the patient exhibits the urge to destroy the effectiveness of the analysis and to dominate the analyst. Beside this phenomenon he puts the life and philosophy of Nietzsche, himself confessedly Satanic, and other concepts of Satan as found in literature. The recipe sounds as revolting as the Witches' cauldron in *Macbeth*. The object of this is to try to find the reason for "self-and-other destruction" and to go on to see if it is possible, having found a reason, to suggest a

cure. It is one thing to find a reason! it is quite another to find a cure. Dr Warner's intentions are of the best, but his suggested cure is merely a small dose of humanism.

The book is not easy to read, for it is bespattered with italics and contains, at the end of every chapter, references which link up with numbers above the text. There are ten chapters and no less than 625 references. One sentence consists of 48 quotations and goes on for two full pages, so that the reader has to turn his head to and fro with such rapidity that he might easily think himself at Wimbledon.

The author is a thorough-going Freudian; indeed, neither Jung nor Adler are deemed worthy of mention, though both would have a great deal to say about the ideas under examination. It is strange that although Anti-Christ is here in some ways uncovered, Christ is never mentioned, and the New Testament suffers the same fate.

Although the author is very much concerned with the human need for love, he, like so many of his school of thought, is perfectly willing to shut his eyes to the claims of him who is Love and the source of all love. It is one thing to attempt an analysis of "self-and-other destruction": it is quite another to attempt to formulate a cure without taking into account One who came "not to destroy but to fulfil". This neglect certainly destroys any practical value the book might have towards the solution of one great problem facing mankind, for the only conclusion Dr Warner draws is that "the road to fullest life and self-realization holds fast to the ethic of brotherhood; its course is through the ways of mutualism, and its foundation rests firmly in love. And it is directed toward the most sublime wisdom of all the books of all our years: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself'." We are then directed to Leviticus 19. 18; to the second commandment of the Law, which depends solely for its working upon the first commandment given by Christ. There is certainly an urge to mass destruction and there is equally certainly a Mass that raises up Mankind. On the one side is the "death wish": on the other, "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly".

NORMAN SMALL